AN

# ESSAY

TOWARDS A

# PROPOSAL

FOR

# CATHOLIC COMMUNION.

WHEREIN

Above Sixty of the principal controverted Points, which have hitherto divided Chriſtendom, being called over, it is examined, how many of them may, and ought to be laid aſide, and how few remain to be accommodated, for the effecting a General Peace.

---

BY A

MINISTER of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

---

LONDON: PRINTED:

AND, DUBLIN: RE-PRINTED,

BY GEORGE BONHAM,

FOR THOMAS WALKER, No. 79, DAME-STREET;

AND SOLD BY R. CROSS, AND P. WOGAN,

BRIDGE STREET.

M.DCC.LXXXI.

15
SEP
69

THE

# PREFACE.

THOSE who have read the antient fathers, and obſerved with what ſeverity they pronounce againſt ſchiſm, will eaſily find an apology for this Eſſay, as far as it aims at the healing of diviſions amongſt the Chriſtian churches. And thoſe who have obſerved, how much *Caſſander*, *Grotius*, *Forbes*, and others, have laboured in compoſing the differences of the reformed churches with the church of *Rome*, ſo to cloſe up that great breach, which has been ſo long between them, will readily excuſe the attempt here made of purſuing the ſame charitable deſign, in regard of our own church.

It is a point I have been long conſidering, and a work for which I have now for ſome years been

preparing, omitting no opportunity of books, or other information, that could give me an inſight into the ſtate of our diviſion. And becauſe I was ſenſible, how abſolutely neceſſary an impartial hand was for carrying on this deſign, therefore my great ſolicitude was, how to break that bias which education, ſtudy, and intereſt had given me in diſfavour of the church of *Rome*. Upon which conſideration, I concluded it the moſt unſuſpected method, not to take information of that church, either from my own idea of it, or from any adverſary, but to let it ſpeak for itſelf; and accordingly, without aſking queſtions of any that are without, I have gone into it as far as was lawful in my ſtation; I have gone into its councils, into its profeſſion of faith, into its moſt approved catechiſms, into its liturgy, into its moſt ſolemn offices, and have every where both enquired,

enquired, and ſearched, what it teaches, what it forbids, what it allows, and what it diſcourages.

This I judged to be a way moſt free from exceptions, as having had the experience, how many miſtakes there are in what is taken up upon credit, eſpecially, where party, or prejudice bring the report in ſuſpicion, and not thinking it at all reaſonable to truſt others, in a caſe where I was not only jealous, but afraid to truſt myſelf.

In this method then, I have enquired of the church of *Rome*, what are the articles of her communion. I have given her the liberty of expounding her own terms, of declaring in what ſenſe ſhe underſtands her own doctrine, and propoſes it to others to be believed; and as ſhe delivers it, ſo I have ſet it down, *not aſſerting* any thing myſelf, but only *making a report* of it in an *hiſtorical* manner, as it is de-

livered by her, and therefore have no concern in defending, but only in the faithful relation of it.

And becauſe my deſign is to ſee if any thing can be done, in order to remove, or leſſen the debates between the church of *England*, and that of *Rome*, therefore I muſt freely own, I have in every point enquired, what is the moſt moderate ſenſe, in which the doctrine of the Roman church is delivered by her own paſtors, ſuch as are within her communion, without being cenſured for what they ſo teach.

I have done the ſame on our ſide, examining how far is granted by thoſe, who ſeem to be men of learning and temper; not charging the opinions of ſuch particular doctors upon our church, but to ſee how far it is tolerated at leaſt, if not allowed within our pale; and while in this, I have made choice of ſuch chiefly, whoſe dignity has made them

them eminent, whoſe learning challenges reſpect, and whoſe labour in the ſtudy of antiquity, qualifies them for ſpeaking in this point; I hope ſo much deference will be had to them, that their depoſitions may be allowed in all ſuch caſes, where the queſtion is of what was taught, and believed in the primitive church; and there will be judged no neceſſity at leaſt, of ſeparate communion, upon the account of ſuch points, which theſe poſitively maintain within our own communion, and as poſitively aſſert to be primitive truths.

By this way I have examined the principal controverted queſtions between the two churches, and by reducing them to certain rules proper in this caſe, have conſidered, how many of them may be compounded, how many be laid by, and which are the remaining differences, which ſtill want an accommodation. I hope,

hope, upon the whole, it will appear, that ſomething is here advanced, in order to a common peace, enough to give encouragement to others to purſue this healing method. For my part, I deſire no peace, if it cannot be obtained without conſenting to error or ſin; but if it can be procured upon any eaſier terms; if ſubmitting to inconvenience, or ſurrendering an intereſt, be the conditions propoſed, I ſhould not think them hard for ſo public a good, as catholic communion, and peace of the church. In this method, and with this diſpoſition of mind, have I proceeded in the following eſſay. If any thing be there offered ſerviceable to this public end, I ſhall rejoice; and if any thing be advanced too far, through overſight, to the prejudice of any goſpel-truth, I leave it to the examination of thoſe in power, to whoſe cenſure I ſubmit all miſtakes.

THE

THE

# CONTENTS.

*THE Preface.* Page 3

*The Occaſion of this Eſſay.* 13

Chap. I. *Rules and Principles for proceeding in this Eſſay.* 21

Chap. II. *Of the Pope.* 31

Chap. III. *Of the Invocation of Saints and Angels.* 72

Chap. IV. *Of Images.* 87

Chap. V. *Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the Real Preſence.* 102

§. I. *Of the Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt.* 110

§. II. *Of the Manner of Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt.* 114

§. III.

§. III. *Something more particular, as to the Manner.* Page 117

§. IV. *Of Tranſubſtantiation.* 124

§. V. *Of the Maſs.* 139

Chap. VI. *Of Communion in one Kind.* 144

Chap. VII. *Of praying for the Dead, and Purgatory.* 155

Chap. VIII. *Of Penances, Indulgences, and the Number of Sacraments.* 169

Chap. IX. *Of Confeſſion, Repentance, and the Pardon of Sins.* 180

Chap. X. *Of Merit, Satisfaction, Works of Supererogation, and Relics.* 192

Chap. XI. *Of breeding People in Ignorance, of praying in an unknown Tongue, and forbidding the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue.* 203

Chap. XII. *Of Tradition, Miracles, Implicit Faith, and Uncharitableneſs.* 213

Chap.

Chap. XIII. *Of leaving out one of the Commandments, of not keeping Faith with Heretics, and of doing Evil, that Good may come of it.* Page 221

Chap. XIV. *Of murthering Proteſtants, of the Plots, Treaſons, and Maſſacres by Papiſts.* 227

Chap. XV. *Of Antichriſt, and the Idolatry of Rome.* 237

Chap. XVI. *Of Ceremonies, the Crucifix, and Lights on the Altar, Incenſe, Sign of the Croſs, and Holy Water.* 242

Chap. XVII. *Of the great Averſeneſs in the Romaniſts, againſt the Engliſh Miniſtry.* 254

Chap. XVIII. *The Concluſion.* 263

BRITISH MUSEUM
15
69
SEP

# AN ESSAY TOWARDS A PROPOSAL FOR CATHOLIC COMMUNION.

## *The Occaſion of this Eſſay.*

BEING appointed to preach a viſitation ſermon, I ſoon judged the Unity of the Church to be a proper ſubject for the acquitting myſelf in ſuch a manner, as might be ſuitable to the aſſembly, which I was to expect: and though an accident diverted me then from that argument, I have ſince reſumed it, and gone on with thoſe ſtudies, wherein I always took great de-

light. But as this had its charm, ſo it met with an allay. For I confeſs, I was ſtruck, upon reflecting, how far we come ſhort, of the beauty and glory of the primitive church. I obſerved the antient church, as one body throughout the world, wherein all national churches were united. Then turning home, I ſighed, and cried out to myſelf: Is not this a great blemiſh to our church, that we are in communion with no part of the chriſtian world; that we are ſeparated from all; that in our iſland, which is but as an atom in compariſon of the univerſe, we are not even united among ourſelves, but have as many diviſions as can be found in all Chriſtendom beſides? Here the love and zeal for that church in which I ever lived, drew tears from me of compaſſion and grief; I could not but lament the narrow bounds of its communion. But as ſo great a concern, in all other caſes, is naturally attended with deſires of relief, and turns the thoughts every way, to ſee, if by any, and by what means, there can be hopes of redreſs; ſo I began to judge it more reaſonable to conſider of help, than to waſte

waſte my ſpirits in uſeleſs complaints. Hence I applied my whole conſideration to examine, if there was no means could be propoſed for taking off the ſtain from our church, by enlarging her communion, and reſtoring her to her primitive ſtate.

This thought met indeed with diſcouragement enough to render it abortive. For I could not but ſee ſuch a temper at home, as might cut off all hopes of accommodation; I ſaw the breach ſo wide between us and the church of *Rome*, that I could foreſee no likelihood of its being healed. But that zeal, that love for our church, which firſt put me upon looking about for the remedy of its unhappy condition, would not let me deſpair. It ſuggeſted, that difficulties ought not to diſcourage the propoſals of a public good, that ſomething is to be attempted, upon the confidence of an over-ruling Providence, improving ofttimes weak endeavours, for the carrying on the greateſt works, beyond what could be expected from the proſpect of human reaſon. Some ſuch arguments were

enough to a willing mind, and hereupon I made it my buſineſs to enquire, what method might probably be ſerviceable, in order to the great end I propoſed.

Inclination firſt led me moſt preſſingly to conſider this with regard to all that diſſent from us at home; for I cannot but own, my ſtrongeſt bent is to do good to my own country and nation, and the firſt glory of a national church is to be united within itſelf. But then reflecting that the unity I propoſed, was of a greater extent, than the bounds of our iſland, and that the communion I deſired, and moſt peculiar to Chriſtianity, was not national only but catholic; hence I ſaw myſelf obliged to paſs our ſeas, and examine the much more conſiderable diviſion from us, I mean, whatever is in communion with the ſee of *Rome*; and upon a full conſideration of each party, I obſerved at length, that *Popery* was at the bottom of all; that this kept us divided from ſo many foreign churches abroad, and that the ſame was made the grounds of our diviſions at home;

home; ſo that this being the true occaſion of the narrowneſs of our communion, and of our ſtanding divided from all Chriſtian churches, there could be no likelihood of our church being bettered, except there could be ſome accommodation found in this grand affair.

Hence to purſue my deſign, I was caſt upon the neceſſity of examining all the doctrines of Popery, to ſee, if there was any poſſibility of leſſening the controverſy between us, and in particular, to enquire whether there could not be communion with that church, without approving, or conſenting to, the many ſcandals, cruelties, errors, ſuperſtitions and idolatries, which commonly make up her character.

On this ſingle point, I plainly ſaw all depended, and it ſeemed as evident to me, that if, upon my enquiry I could either give hope, or prepare things for an accommodation of ſuch differences, as have hitherto kept us divided from the greateſt part of Chriſtendom, and likewiſe occaſioned diviſions amongſt ourſelves; it would be ſervice to our

church, in opening by one expedient, a way to peace both at home and abroad, and preparing for catholic communion, which as it was the ornament of the primitive, ſo it ought to be the glory now of every part of the catholic church.

This taſk, I foreſaw, could not fail of being attended with perſonal inconveniences, and laying me under an ill name. But however, I ſaw reaſon enough ſtill to encourage the undertaking. For certainly, if ſchiſms and diviſions are the ſcandal of the church, and the triumph of devils, it muſt needs be commendable to uſe all endeavours for removing or leſſening them. If contentions and religious wars are the overthrow of religion, the love of God and religion, muſt encourage the propoſal of all lawful expedients for the reſtoring of peace.

Well, and upon theſe principles do I think it reaſonable to open the communion of our church, and to let in popery? No, far be this thought from me; I enter here a proteſtation againſt idolatry and ſuperſtition, and whatſoever is oppoſite

oppoſite to the rules of the goſpel. But at the ſame time, it may be reaſonable to do here, as we generally do with the worſt of our enemies. For, if carrying on war with ſuch, is conſiderably prejudicial to the ſtate, it is certainly no diſſervice to the public, to ſee how near we can come to peace, and to enquire if there be no poſſibility of removing any of thoſe things, which are laid hold on as the juſt occaſion of proſecuting the war.

So far as this I may propoſe in the caſe of all our religious wars; and if for ſo doing, I am traduced as a papiſt, I value it not. I am contented with the worſt of ſlanders, ſo I can any ways contribute to the removing of ſchiſm. I embrace all that ignorance and malice can invent, ſo I can but be ſo happy as to do any thing for taking off the infamous character given the Chriſtian world, and reſtore our church to the beauty and order of the primitive. If I can but even remotely prepare for ſo good a work, I ſhall not ſet any perſonal inconveniencies in the balance againſt it;

it; being aſſured that while the raſh, furious and ſchiſmatical brains expreſs their gall, I ſhall have the encouragement of the better part, the judicious, ſober, and pious, who at preſent lament the unhappy ſtate of our church.

In order to what I have here propoſed, I intend to touch at the moſt conſiderable controverſies that are between the two churches. Not to diſpute them over again, for that has been ſufficiently done by many learned pens; but to ſee if there be any of thoſe points can be laid aſide, which have hitherto been made the ſubject of moſt uncharitable heats, and encreaſed our diviſion. If I find any ſuch, and mark them out, I ſhall ſo far concur to the leſſening the number of our contentions, as likewiſe to examine in what points the controverſy ſticks, upon the deciſion of which, our common peace, and even catholic communion depends; and if theſe can be reduced to a ſlender number, I hope it may be a ſervice to the public, and that hence ſome pious ſouls, and lovers of unity, will be encouraged to ſee if there

be

be a poſſibility of doing any thing for the compoſing of them.

---

## CHAP. I.

### *Rules and Principles for proceeding in this Eſſay.*

FOR better diſcovering, if there be any point of controverſy which can, and ought to be laid aſide, and proceeding more clearly in this important ſubject, I ſet down ſome rules relating to church communion, and principally thoſe preſcribed by the moſt reverend Dr. *Sharp*, archbiſhop of *York*, in his ſermon preached before the Lord Mayor at *Guildhall* chapel, 1674; where having learnedly and zealouſly preſſed our diſſenters with obligation of church-communion, he labours to remove the occaſions of the ſchiſm; and that all may purſue theſe things that make for peace, he gives ſome rules, which ſeem evident above diſpute.

The firſt rule is, *to diſtinguiſh careſully between matters of* faith, *and matters of* opinion; *and as to theſe latter, to be willing, that every one ſhould enjoy the liberty of judging for himſelf.* And conſequently, that matters of *opinion* ought to be no hinderance to communion with a church which impoſes no ſuch opinions on its members, but leaves every one to judge in ſuch matters as ſeems moſt reaſonable to them.

Another rule is, *That* errors *in a* church *as to matter of* doctrines, *or* corruptions, *as to matter of* practice, *ſo long as theſe* errors *and* corruptions *are only* ſuffered, *but not* impoſed, *cannot be a ſufficient cauſe of* ſeparation; *the reaſon is, becauſe theſe things are not* ſins *in us, ſo long as we do not join with the church in them. So that ſo long as we can communicate with a* church *without either profeſſing her errors, or partaking in her ſinful practices, as in the preſent caſe it is ſuppoſed we may do; ſo long we are bound, upon the principle before laid down, not to ſeparate from her.* And conſequently, ſuch errors in doctrines, or corruptions

in

in practice, ought to be no hinderance to communion.

A third rule is, *Never to quarrel about* words *and* phraſes; *but ſo long as other men mean muchwhat the ſame that we do, let us be content, though they have not the luck to expreſs themſelves ſo well.* Where it is alſo noted how, *It often happens, that moſt bitter quarrels do commence, not ſo much from the different* ſenſe *of the contending parties, concerning the things they contend about, as from the different* terms *expreſſing the ſame* ſenſe, *and the different* grounds *they proceed upon, or* arguments *they make uſe of for the proof of it.* And conſequently, that difference of terms and phraſes ought to be no hinderance to communion.

A fourth rule is, *Never to charge upon men the* conſequences *of their* opinions, *when they expreſsly diſown them.* Where it is alſo to be obſerved that, *This is another thing doth hugely tend to widen our differences, and to exaſperate mens ſpirits one againſt another; when having examined ſome* opinion *of a* man, *or* party *of* men, *and finding very great* abſurdities, *and*

*evil*

*evil* conſequences *neceſſarily to flow from it, we preſently throw all thoſe into the* diſh *of them that hold the* opinion, *as if they could not own the* one, *but they muſt neceſſarily own the* other: *Whereas indeed, the men we thus charge, may be ſo innocent in this matter, that they do not in the leaſt dream of ſuch* conſequences; *or if they did, they would be ſo far from* owning *them, that they would abhor the* opinion *for their ſakes.*

A fifth rule is, *That* unſcriptural impoſitions *are not a warrantable cauſe of* ſeparation *from a church; ſuppoſing that by* unſcriptural *be meant no more than what is neither* commanded *nor* forbid *in the ſcriptures. For the actions required by theſe* unſcriptural impoſitions, *are either in themſelves* lawful *to be done, or* not lawful *to be done. If they be in themſelves unlawful to be done, then they do not fall under that notion of* unſcriptural *we here ſpeak of; they are downright* ſins, *and ſo either* particularly, *or in the* general, *forbid in the* ſcripture. *If they be in themſelves* lawful *to be done, then it cannot be imagined how their being* commanded, *can make them* unlawful:

unlawful: *So that in this caſe, there is no* ſin *in yielding obedience to the* church, *and conſequently no cauſe of withdrawing our communion from it.*

A ſixth rule is, *That there are but* two *caſes wherein it can be lawful to* withdraw *our* communion *from a church, becauſe there are but two caſes wherein* communion *with her can be* ſinful. *One is, when the* church *requires of us, as a condition of her* communion, *an* acknowledgment *and* profeſſion *of that for a* truth, *which we know to be an* error. *The other is, when the* church *requires of us, as a condition of her communion, the joining with her in ſome practices, which we know to be againſt the* laws *of* God. *In theſe two caſes, to withdraw our obedience to the* church, *is ſo far from being a* ſin, *that it is a neceſſary* duty, *becauſe we have an obligation to the* laws *of God, antecedent to that, we have to* thoſe *of the* church; *and we are bound to obey* theſe *no farther than they are conſonant or agreeable to* thoſe.

Theſe are *aſſertions* and *rules* gathered out of this ſermon, though not ſet down all in this order; and though directed only

only to the diſſenters, yet are ſo very well grounded, juſt, and reaſonable in themſelves, that they ought to be obſerved in all caſes where the queſtion is of church communion; ſo far (and I dare boldly ſay it) that there is no Chriſtian church in the world, can pretend its communion to be reaſonable or ever lawful, which will not allow of theſe rules. For, to touch at ſome of them, What church can pretend its communion to be lawful, if matters of opinion, and bare ſchool deciſions are allowed a juſt exception againſt communicating with it? Or who can be a member of any church, if it be on condition to approve all the opinions of men or parties of men, that are in communion with it? Again, Where is the church, whoſe communion is lawful, if there be a neceſſity of approving all the corrupt practices of men or party of men, that are, or have been in it? Hence it muſt be allowed by all churches, that matters of *opinion* or *corrupt practices*, which are not impoſed on any, are not a ſufficient exception againſt communicating with them.

Again,

Again, that conſequences ought not to be charged, is what all churches are concerned in, ſince there is none, but whoſe doctrines are, or may be, rendered monſtrous by conſequential abſurdity, according to the reaſoning at leaſt of adverſe parties. And therefore, for preventing the overthrow of all peace, all have reaſon to compound in the allowance of this principle. Eſpecially too ſince the higheſt truth of chriſtianity muſt be expoſed to the liberties of blaſpheming, and impious tongues, if common reaſon ſhall be allowed to deſcribe them in all their ſeeming evident conſequences.

All churches are likewiſe concerned in the fifth rule of unſcriptural impoſitions, ſuch as are neither commanded, or forbid in ſcripture. Since there is no chriſtian congregation, which has the face of a church, but what claims this right, and likewiſe practiſes it, and therefore cannot make that a ſufficient objection againſt communion, but by deſtroying itſelf.

But if there be any Chriſtian church ſo well circumſtanced, as not to be neceſſitated, to allow of theſe rules; yet I think, I may own it without caſting any blemiſh on our church, I may own it, I ſay, that ours does, and muſt allow of them; ſince it would not be reaſonable to expect any to communicate with us, if we make it *a condition of communion*, to ſubſcribe, or approve all the opinions, or corrupt practices, there are, or have been found in the members, or even paſtors of it. This is what no chriſtian church can pretend to; there being no church which is not forced to tolerate many opinions, and corrupt practices in ſome of its members, which it cannot think reaſonable to impoſe on ſuch as deſire to be incorporated in it.

If then we allow theſe rules, in order to the removing miſtakes, and leſſening controverſies with ſuch as here at home diſſent from us: it ſeems juſt we ſhould obſerve the ſame rules in the examining all other controverſies, and think it reaſonable to lay aſide all ſuch contentions, as according to theſe rules are, or ought

to

to be no obſtruction to communion. So far the love of juſtice, and deſire of chriſtian peace ſeem to oblige us. And if (as *Prov.* 20. 10.) *Divers weights, and divers meaſures are both of them alike abomination to the Lord* in all caſes, though but of common dealings betwixt man and man; they muſt be much more ſo in caſes on which depend the peace of the Chriſtian world. Upon the conſideration of which common peace, and upon the deſire that catholic communion, may be again reſtored to the world, which was the honour and beauty of the primitive church, and is ſo much ſighed for by many pious, and learned men, I proceed to examine the controverſial debates which are between the two churches, and taking theſe rules along with me, will ſee according to this meaſure, which points may be laid down, and ought not to obſtruct communion; as likewiſe which they are, which are ſtill to be inſiſted on, as requiring a public accommodation, before there can be that univerſal communion which is deſired. But while I ſpeak of catholic communion, and often in this eſſay mention communion

munion with the *Roman* church, I here declare, I intend no communion, infringing the rights and liberties of our national church, but only ſuch as was formerly in the primitive church, when all biſhops of the earth were known by their communicatory letters; when they ſaluted one another by the name of brethren and colleagues; when each biſhop maintained the rights of his own church, and expreſſed a zeal for, and was concerned in, the good of the whole; when charity cemented divided nations into one body, and of all believers made one kingdom, one myſtical body of Chriſt. Such a catholic communion is what I propoſe, it is what I earneſtly deſire, it is the only meaning of all that is in this little eſſay; and therefore I deſire the candid reader to ſtretch no expreſſions beyond this ſenſe, for if he does, I here renounce it as an impoſition. Now ſince our controverſial diviſions are the chief obſtruction of this deſirable unity; therefore I muſt here ſee how far theſe may be leſſened. And I ſhall begin with that which abounds with the greateſt difficulties.

CHAP.

## CHAP. II.

### *Of the Pope.*

UNDER this head, of ſo great import, there are ſeveral controverſial points, which have occaſioned great heats, and helped to keep open the breach between the two churches. Theſe I ſhall ſet down in order, and having conſidered them in ſhort, ſhall then apply the rule to them, and ſee what is the reſult.

*Queſt.* I. Whether the Pope be infallible in his definitions and doctrines, ſo that all who are in communion with him are bound to receive, and believe them, as unqueſtionable truths?

This, in a great part, is ſo taught by *Bellarmin*; and if the point were, upon what terms we were to be in communion with *Bellarmin*; it is certain it could not be, but by ſubſcribing ſuch an infallibility. But our queſtion is about the communion with his church: And having found, upon ſtrict examination, that the church in communion with the ſee of

of *Rome*, requires no aſſent to ſuch a papal infallibility: That it is not ſo much as mentioned in the definition of the council of *Florence*, in which the controverſy of the papal authority and prerogative, was profeſſedly and fully diſcuſſed: That it is not in the *formula* of faith, ſet forth by Pope *Pius* IV. collected out of the council of *Trent*, and of which all promoted to church dignities, are obliged to make a ſolemn profeſſion: That it is not propoſed to ſuch as are admitted members into that communion: That it has no place, either in their catechiſm *ad parochos*, nor in other catechiſms, which are for the general inſtruction of the people: Having found likewiſe, that *Bellarmin* (*l. de Rom. Pont. c.* 11.) owns five eminent doctors poſitively denying this infallibility of the Pope, without being cenſured by their church for ſuch their tenets: That the famous *Launoius* (298. *Ep. To.* 4. *Ep. ad Hen. Barillonum*) reckons up twelve univerſities, *Bononia*, *Pavia*, *Sienna* in *Italy*, *Louvain* in *Belgia*, *Cologne*, and *Hertford* in *Germany*, *Vienna* in *Auſtria*, *Cracow* in *Poland*,

*land, Anjou, Orleans, Toulouſe* and *Paris* in *France*; and beſides theſe numerous bodies, ſeven and fifty ſingle writers, amongſt which are many eminent biſhops, archbiſhops and cardinals (*Id. To. 3. Ep. 2. ad Chriſtoph. Fauveum*) *viz.* ſeventeen of the *Pariſian* ſchool, three of the *Spaniſh*, one of *Oxford*, five *Germans*, and no leſs than one and thirty in *Italy* alone; all profeſſedly writing againſt this infallibility of the Pope, without any cenſure paſſed againſt them from that church; having found, I ſay, this, it ſeems evident from hence, that this papal infallibility is no term of communion with that church; that it is no more than a matter of opinion, and not of faith; and conſequently, that according to our firſt rule, this queſtion ought to be laid aſide by the lovers of peace, and not made an obſtruction to catholic communion, ſince within the communion of the *Roman* church, this infallibility of the Pope may be, and is as ſtifly oppoſed, as by thoſe that are out of it; and why then ſhould our undue heats be kept up upon this account, whereas

that

that church obliges not its members to aſſent to any ſuch doctrine?

*Queſt.* II. Whether thoſe in communion with the church of *Rome*, are bound to believe virtue to be wicked, and vice to be good, if it ſhall pleaſe his holineſs to ſay ſo?

This is no where declared in the councils of *Florence*, or *Trent*; it has no place in any *profeſſion* of their faith, it is not taught in their *catechiſms*, it is no where propoſed as a *term* of communion. But the full account of this is, that it is an expreſſion of *Bellarmin*, (*de Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 5.) who carries the Pope's infallibility ſo high, that he ſays, it is impoſſible for the Pope ſo to err, as to declare virtue to be wicked, and vice to be good: And to prove this, *ab inconvenienti*, he thus argues; if this infallibility be not granted in the Pope, then it would be attended with this fatal conſequence, That if he ſhould declare virtue to be bad, and vice to be good, all would be bound to believe it; having firſt ſuppoſed it impoſſible he ſhould ever make ſuch a declaration. In the ſame manner,

ner, as if any one, to prove that the ſcripture cannot err, in commanding vice, or forbidding virtue, ſhould ſay, we be bound to believe virtue to be evil, and vice to be good, becauſe we are bound to believe that to be evil which the ſcripture forbids, and that good, which it commands. In which manner of arguing, *ab inconvenienti*, there is no abſurdity, it having been before eſtabliſhed as a certain truth, that it is impoſſible it ſhould ſo err. Here is the hiſtory of this point; and it being here evident, that the preſent queſtion, as to the affirmative, is not ſo much as a common opinion among the writers of the *Roman* communion, but only a way of arguing made uſe of by one author, at the ſame time ſuppoſing it impoſſible, it ſeems but juſt, that this controverſy ſhould be laid by, according to our firſt rule, and not made an obſtruction to a common union, ſince within the communion of the *Roman* church as well as out of it, there is the ſame liberty of maintaining this propoſition, as a certain truth, that if in fact the Pope ſhould at any time declare vir-

tue

tue to be wicked, and vice to be good, all are ſtrictly bound in conſcience not to believe him nor adhere to him, in ſuch a declaration. Thus I find this difficulty expounded by one of their own writers.

*Queſt.* III. Whether the Pope be ſuch an univerſal infallible guide, that the whole church depends in an arbitrary manner upon his orders and deciſions, ſo as to be paramount, and ſuperior to general councils?

So high as this, *Bellarmin* ſeems to carry the Papal ſupremacy, and there is no being in communion with him, but on theſe terms. But as to the *Roman* church, which is the ſubject of my enquiry, there is no aſſent required to any ſuch doctrine. There is no ſuch doctrine declared, either in the council of *Florence*, or *Trent*; it is not contained in the *profeſſion* of faith, which is offered to all beneficed perſons, as a teſt of their being orthodox in the belief of that church. It is not in their public *catechiſm*, compoſed for inſtructing the people in the faith of their church. The aſſent to ſuch doctrine is neither impoſ-

ed,

ed; or demanded of any that are admitted into that communion. And this ſeems enough to conclude it be no matter of *faith*, but only *opinion*, in which every one is left with the liberty of judging for himſelf, and conſequently, according to our firſt rule, this queſtion ought not to be inſiſted on. But however, to give ſome farther evidence of its being no more than an opinion, I will add, That I find the council of *Piſa* held by many as general, ſhewed itſelf in fact, not to be of *Bellarmin*'s judgment. Whilſt itfirſt depoſed *Benedict* XIII. and *Gregory* XII. and afterwards elected *Alexander* V. into their place, which council was by the ſame *Alexander* twice confirmed. Secondly, That the councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, have expreſsly in terms declared the ſupreme power of the church militant under Chriſt, over all the faithful, even over the Pope himſelf, to be in general councils, as to defining matters of faith, aboliſhing ſchiſms, and reforming the church, both in the head and members, and that all perſons whatever, and amongſt others, the very Pope himſelf,

ſelf, is bound to obey, and be ſubject to their decrees. *Conc. Conſt. Seſſ.* 4. and 5. *Conc. Baſil. Seſſ.* 3. Thirdly, that it has been a practice to appeal from the bulls of divers Popes to a future general council. The univerſity of *Paris* has thus appealed four ſeveral times. The emperor *Charles* V. made a like appeal; and ſeveral others are recorded by *Richerius Hiſt. Conc. Conſtant.* p. 259. *Edit. Colon.* in 4*to*. Fourthly, that *Launoius* has alleged the teſtimonies of thirty-five Popes, for the ſuperiority of councils over the Pope, P. I. *Ep. ad Hieron. Sambævium.* Fifthly, That in the decree of the council of *Florence*, the exerciſe of the Papal power, whatever it be, is limited, and tied to the obſervation of œcumenical councils, and the ſacred canons, and conſequently ſubjected to them. *Quemadmodum & in geſtis œcumenicorum conciliorum, & in ſacris canonibus continetur*: which are the words of the ſaid decree. Upon all which it ſeems plain, that the arbitrary power of the Pope, in his deciſions and government of the church, is not a matter of faith, in

that

that church: but that as it is maintained by *Bellarmin*, ſo the contrary is as poſitively aſſerted by others of his church, and conſequently, that it is only a polemical queſtion, in which every one has the liberty of judging for himſelf, and therefore by our firſt rule, not to be made an obſtruction to communion. And were the negative part ſo temerarious and falſe, as *Bellarmin* cenſures it, yet ſince he is cenſured as ſeverely by others for this his cenſure; *Veron. Rul. of Faith.* c. 4. Since neither ſide is any where impoſed by that church, ſtill according to our ſecond rule, this queſtion ought not to be inſiſted on; becauſe whichever ſide is in an error, yet the communion of the church is ſo open, that it may be joined with, without profeſſing or giving any aſſent to ſuch error.

*Queſt.* IV. Whether the Pope has a power over temporals, ſo as to depoſe princes, and to abſolve their ſubjects from their allegiance?

So *Bellarmin* aſſerts, and, under theſe terms there is no communicating with him: But as to his church, the terms of

communion are very different. For that does not require aſſent to any ſuch doctrine. It is not in the profeſſion of faith; it has no place in the catechiſm *ad Parochos*; nor other common catechiſms, compoſed for inſtructing all in the faith of that church; it is not impoſed on any in that communion, and therefore, according to our ſecond rule, though never ſo erroneous, is not enough to hinder communion.

The proof of all this, *viz.* That the depoſing doctrine is no part of the faith of that church, nor impoſed on any, ſeems very evident, from the great numbers, not only of ſingle writers, but likewiſe of univerſities in that communion, which allow not of this depoſing power, but ſtrongly oppoſe it, as a doctrine new, and erroneous. Thus it is oppoſed by the whole *Gallican* church, and was expreſsly condemned by eight univerſities in *France*, *An.* 1626, declaring *Santarellus*'s opinion of the Pope's depoſing power, as falſe, erroneous, contrary to the word of God, pernicious, ſeditious and deteſtable. To this add, that the treatiſe

tiſe of *Mariana, de Rege & Regis Inſtitutione*, which ſpeaks too favourably of the depoſing power, had been long before cenſured and burned by the ſecular authority at *Paris*, and diſallowed by decree of the college of *Sorbon*. And as for ſingle writers, that join in oppoſing the depoſing power, a large liſt of them may be ſeen collected by a reverend, and moſt learned biſhop of our own church, *Joannes Roſſenſis de Poteſt. Tempor. Pap.* l. 2. c. 1. Where he ſets down a great number of canoniſts, divines, hiſtorians, &c. all concurring in the ſame ſentiments, and afterwards concludes in theſe words; *If we add thoſe numberleſs numbers of biſhops, prieſts, monks, clerks, people, who notwithſtanding all the excommunications, bulls, depoſitions, privations, curſes, interdictions of Popes remained conſtant, even to blood, and death, in their allegiance to their depoſed princes*; quam pauci imo quam nulli ſunt illi ſeptuaginta Bellarminiani authores, ſi cum illis catholiciſſimis & conſtantiſſimis fidelibus conferantur. *How few, or rather, how none, will theſe ſeventy* Bellarminian *witneſſes appear to be, when com-*

*pared with thoſe moſt catholic, and conſtant believers, even biſhops, who both before and after this controverſy began, deteſted that power or rather tyranny?* Out of which without looking farther, it muſt be confeſſed that as *Bellarmin*, with many others, aſſerts the depoſing power, ſo there are far more in the ſame communion, who poſitively diſown, and even condemn it, without being caſt out of the ſaid communion, for holding ſuch doctrine contrary to the Pope's intereſt; and conſequently, that the depoſing power being no more than an *opinion* of ſome in that church, and no matter of faith, there ought to be no breach of communion upon this account, according to our firſt rule, it being as free for thoſe in that communion to deny the depoſing power, as for thoſe that are out of it.

*Queſt.* V. Whether the depoſing doctrine being aſſerted in *Gratian*'s decrees, and the canon law, does not make it an article of faith, or oblige all of that communion to aſſent to it?

I find

I find *Gratian*'s decrees to be the work of a private author, who can claim nothing of faith, as *Veron's Rule of Faith* in terms declares, c. 2. it having likewiſe many miſtakes, as the ſame *Veron* aſſerts, and which is farther manifeſted by *Antonius Auguſtinus*, archbiſhop of *Arragon*, in his dialogues *de emendatione Gratiani*. So that the certainty of faith cannot be built on ſuch a foundation. The ſame is the fate of the whole canon law, in which *Bellarmin* himſelf acknowledges ſeveral errors, *De Rom. Pont.* l. 4. c. 12. And *Canus*, though a great aſſerter of the canon law, does not only confeſs, that the being of any poſition in the canon law, does not conclude it to be a doctrine of faith, but likewiſe acknowledges, that ſeveral decretals therein contained, have been by other ſucceeding Popes, and upon better advice, repealed, and the quite contrary eſtabliſhed. *Loc. Theol.* l. 5. c. 5. *in Reſp. ad ult.* & l. 6. If then all ſuch decretals as are in the canon law, are not propoſed nor eſteemed, as of faith, nor impoſed on any in that communion, the contents of them,

according to our firſt and ſecond rules, are not to obſtruct a common union.

*Queſt.* VI. Whether the practice of this doctrine in ſeveral Popes, who have depoſed emperors and kings, does not prove it to be a doctrine neceſſarily to be believed by all in that communion?

There is no rule in that church, which obliges the members even to approve, much leſs believe all that is practiſed by their Popes. *Bellarmin* himſelf, who would make the Pope infallible *in cathedra*, does not pretend to exempt him from error in *fact*; and as for all the others of that communion, whom we have reckoned above, diſſenting from *Bellarmin*, theſe unanimouſly declare the Pope to be fallible in all other caſes, except when joined with the whole church, and that too with relation to *credenda* only, and not to matters of fact, or matters of diſcipline, or in framing laws not neceſſary to ſalvation. For in theſe, they ſay, both Pope, and general councils, may err: And that no national church is obliged to receive what is decreed by ſuch councils, except only as to *credenda*,

but

but not as to laws and diſcipline. And this is, in fact, the practice of that church. Hence it muſt be owned, that what is decreed, or practiſed by the Pope, ſeparate from ſuch a general council, is of a much inferior rank, in whatever concerns diſcipline and practice; and conſequently, that there are none obliged to receive, or approve ſuch his practices now mentioned. And therefore there is found no obligation upon thoſe in the Pope's communion, of approving, or aſſenting to all his holineſs does: it is not ſo much as required of biſhops in that *formula* of obedience, which they take at their conſecration, neither has it place in any profeſſion of faith. But on the contrary, all in that communion are at liberty of diſſenting from ſuch uſurpations of the Pope. And accordingly I find the ſubjects of depoſed princes continuing faithful in their allegiance to them after ſuch ſentence of depoſition pronounced againſt them, and this both of biſhops, prieſts, monks, clergy and laity, even to the loſs of their lives, in aſſerting the rights of their prince, notwithſtanding

all the interdicts of the Popes to the contrary; as has been now evidenced from the teſtimony of our own learned *Roſſenſis Contr. Bell.* l. 1. c. 8. and can be from *Caron Remonſtr. Hibern. Part* 2. c. 6, 7. Where likewiſe may be ſeen a liſt of ſeveral councils of *German*, *French* and *Italian* biſhops, condemning the depoſing doctrine, and even the author of it, *Gregory* VII. Upon which there can be no ſurpriſe in what a learned modern (who has made ſufficient enquiry into all theſe matters) declares, *That the depoſing doctrine is rather taught by the court, than church of* Rome. *Regal.* p. 163. *Ed.* 1. Whence it muſt be owned whilſt in that communion there appears ſo ſtrong an oppoſition againſt the depoſing doctrine, and even againſt all the practice of ſuch Popes, as have acted by it, That neither the doctrine, nor practice are matters of *faith* in that communion, nor *impoſed* on any, and conſequently however erroneous the doctrine, or corrupt the practice be, yet ſtill according to our ſecond rule, this ought not to be made a cauſe of ſeparation, ſince there may be com-

munion

munion with that church without profeſſing ſuch errors, or partaking in ſuch ſinful practices.

*Queſt.* VII. Whether the depoſing of *Frederic* II. Emperor by *Innocent* IV. in the firſt council of *Lyons*: Or the third canon of the great council of *Lateran*, in favour of the depoſing power, be proof of the neceſſity of this ſeditious doctrine being abetted by all in communion with that church?

The great numbers of both *clergy* and *laity* in that communion, diſapproving, and even in terms, condemning the depoſing power, is argument enough, that they do not believe themſelves obliged by any thing that paſſed in the aforeſaid councils of *Lyons* or *Lateran* to approve that doctrine ſo pernicious to all princes. The reaſons they give of not being ſo obliged, are theſe: Firſt, as to the depoſition of *Frederic* II. That that act of depoſition was only a *judicial ſentence*, in a *particular caſe* involving many particular matters of fact, of *one* particular perſon. And that as it is not the doctrine of their church to hold even a general council to

be

be infallible in any ſuch meer *judicial ſentence*; ſo their church does no where oblige them even to approve ſuch a *ſentence*, much leſs to take it for a *canon*, or *rule* of their *faith*: and conſequently, that in their communion, they are as much at liberty of diſapproving what there paſſed, as thoſe that are out of it. However, therefore, this doctrine be erroneous, yet ſince being in that communion does not oblige to the profeſſing ſuch an error, as it is evident by matter of fact; hence, according to our ſecond rule, this queſtion, as to the council of *Lyons*, may be laid by, and occaſion no difference between us: it being above diſpute, that we ourſelves cannot more zealouſly condemn this opinion, than the *Gallican* church does, who beſides the doctrine, have utterly exploded the whole volume of the canon law, called *Sextus Decretalium*, when *Boniface* VIII. had inſerted that fatal ſentence againſt *Frederic*. And ſo, as to the third canon of *Lateran*, they do not think themſelves obliged to believe, or even approve the depoſing doctrine, upon any thing that is there delivered,

vered, and here I ſet down the reaſons they give for this. Firſt, becauſe thoſe Lateran canons are ſuſpected as ſpurious, as it is owned by our famous *Roſſenſis. De Pot. Pap.* l. 1. c. 6. and by archbiſhop *Bramhall* in his *Schiſm Guarded.* Secondly, There is not a word in that canon againſt Prince or King, or any ſupreme Lord whatever, but only feudatories. Thirdly, the Fathers in ordering the Pope to depoſe feudatories, acted on the authority of the ſupreme temporal lords of the fee, who were preſent by their embaſſadors, and were conſenting to it, for raiſing money to carry on the holy war, and for keeping peace in their abſence in the Holy Land. Laſtly, It is only a canon of diſcipline, in which *faith* is not concerned, which no nation is obliged to receive; and conſequently, which lays no obligation upon conſcience to aſſent to it. It is not my buſineſs to examine into theſe reaſons, but matter of fact is proof enough, that they believe themſelves no ways obliged in conſcience by that canon, ſince in *Germany* and *France*, they have acted contrary

trary to the depoſing ſenſe of it. Whatever, therefore, their reaſons be, it is enough for our preſent purpoſe, that both clergy and laity, abiding in that communion, condemn the depoſing doctrine with all the bad practices; and therefore, ſince the being of that communion does not oblige any to partake in ſuch errors, or corrupt practices, according to our ſecond rule, ſuch errors and practices, ought not to be made the occaſion of diſunion.

*Queſt.* VIII. Whether a nation that owns the Pope's authority, can be free from ſlavery?

I ſet down the judgment of others relating to this ſubject: And Firſt, I find an eminent prelate of our own church, archbiſhop *Bramhall*, relating the fundamental laws of *France*, and the liberties of the *Gallican* church; and as to the civil government, theſe are ſome of them:

1. The Pope cannot command, or ordain any thing, directly or indirectly, concerning any temporal affairs within the dominions of the king of *France*.

2. No

2. No command whatſoever of the Pope, can free the *French* clergy from their obligation to obey the commands of their ſovereign.

3. The commiſſions and bulls of the Pope's Legates, are to be ſeen, examined and approved by the court of parliament, and to be regiſtered and publiſhed with ſuch cautions and modifications, as that court ſhall judge expedient for the good of the kingdom; and to be executed according to the ſaid cautions, and not otherwiſe.

4. The prelates of the *French* church, (although commanded by the Pope) for what cauſe ſoever it be, may not depart out of the kingdom without the King's command or licence.

5. The Pope can neither by himſelf, nor by his delegates, judge of any thing, which concerns the ſtate, pre-eminence, or privilege of the crown of *France*, nor of any thing pertaining to it. Nor can there be any queſtion, or proceſs about the ſtate, or pretenſion of the king, but in his own courts.

6. Papal

6. Papal bulls, citations, ſentences, excommunications, and the like, are not to be executed in *France*, without the King's command or permiſſion: And after permiſſion, only by authority of the king, and not by the authority of the Pope, to ſhun confuſion, and mixture of juriſdiction.

7. Neither the King, nor his realm, nor his officers can be excommunicated, or interdicted by the Pope, nor his ſubjects abſolved from their oath of allegiance.

8. The Pope cannot impoſe penſions in *France* upon any benefices, having cure of ſouls; nor upon any others, but according to the canons, according to the expreſs condition of the reſignation, or *ad redimendam vexationem.*

9. Eccleſiaſtical perſons may be convented, judged and ſentenced before a ſecular judge; for the firſt grievous or enormous crime, or for leſſer offences after a relapſe, which renders them incorrigible in the eye of the law.

10. All the prelates of *France* are bliged to ſwear fealty to the King, and to receive

receive from him their inveſtitures for their fees or manors.

He adds ſeveral others of the like nature; and by many inſtances ſhews in theſe very words, That the Kings of *France*, with peers, parliaments, embaſſadors, ſchools and univerſities, have all of them in all ages affronted and curbed the *Roman* court, and reduced them to a right temper and conſtitution, as often as they deviated from the canons of the fathers, and encroached on the liberties of the *Gallican* church; whereby the Pope's juriſdiction in *France* came to be merely diſcretionary, at the pleaſure of the King. And notwithſtanding this, the Kings of *France* are acknowledged by the Popes themſelves, to be the moſt chriſtian, the eldeſt ſons of the church, and protectors of the *Roman* ſee. So this prelate, *Juſt. Vindic. of the Ch. of Eng. Diſc.* 3. *ch.* 8.

In the ſame chapter, he gives as many inſtances of the *German emperors* in maintaining the rights of the empire, notwithſtanding all oppoſition made againſt them by the Pope, and ſets down the pro-

proteſtation of the electoral college, and other princes of the empire, mentioned in their letter ſent to Pope *Benedict* XII. *viz.* That they would maintain, defend, and preſerve inviolate, the rights, honours, goods, liberties and cuſtoms of the empire, and their own electoral right, belonging to them by law or cuſtom, againſt all men, of what pre-eminence, dignity, or ſtate ſoever, notwithſtanding any perils, or mandates, or proceſſes whatſoever.

He goes on, ſhewing the ſame at large of the King of *Spain*, both as to *Spain*, *Flanders* and *Sicily*, as likewiſe of the King of *Portugal*, and of the ſtate of *Venice*, all maintaining the rights and liberties of their reſpective ſtates with as much oppoſition to the Pope, as to any other invader whatever. He inſerts likewiſe of *England*, in the time of owning the Pope's authority, That the Pope's decrees never had the force of laws here, without the confirmation of the King, witneſs the decrees of the council of *Lateran*, as they are called. That the Kings

of

of *England* ſuffered no appeals to *Rome*, out of their kingdoms, no *Roman* Legates to enter into their dominions without their licenſe, and declared the Pope's bulls to be void. And having thus run through all nations, he thus concludes: *We have ſaid enough to ſhew, That all Chriſtian nations do challenge the right to themſelves, to be the laſt judges of their own liberties and privileges.* And thus gives his opinion in anſwer to this eighth queſtion; That all nations which own the Pope, are judges of their own liberties, and have on all occaſions aſſerted them with as much freedom againſt the Pope, as againſt any other invader.

*Hugo Grotius*, who ſpared no pains in informing himſelf of all theſe matters in the difference of churches, and therefore is fit to be heard as an evidence, gives likewiſe his opinion in a few words, as to this point. *The authority*, ſays he, *of the* Roman *biſhop would not have ſeemed ſo formidable to Dr.* Hall, *that he ſhould therefore caſt off all hope of reconciliation, had he known how ready the remedies are in*

France

France *and* Spain, *to reſtrain the Pope from invading the rights, either of the Kings, or biſhops.* Judgment of religion, Lond. 1653. A full anſwer in a few words.

*Queſt.* IX. Whether a national church, that owns the Pope, can maintain its national rights and liberties, without being enſlaved by *Rome.*

Here again we muſt hear the opinions, or at leaſt the account given by the now mentioned archbiſhop *Bramhall,* and *Grotius.* The former relating the immunities of the *Gallican* church amongſt other articles, ſets down theſe: 1. That the ſpiritual authority, and power of the Pope, is not abſolute in *France,* but limited, and reſtrained by the canons and rules of the ancient councils of the church, received in that kingdom. Where obſerve firſt, That the Pope can do nothing in *France,* as a ſovereign ſpiritual Prince, with his *non obſtantes,* either againſt the canons, or beſides the canons. Secondly, That the canons are no canons in *France,* except they be received.

2. The

2. The moſt Chriſtian King has had power at all times, according to the occurrence, and exigency of affairs, to aſſemble, or cauſe to be aſſembled ſynods provincial, or national; and therein to treat, not only of ſuch things as concern the conſervation of the civil eſtate; but alſo of ſuch things as concern eccleſiaſtical order and diſcipline in his own dominions, and therein to make rules, laws, ordinances, in his own name, and in his own authority.

3. The Pope cannot ſend a legate *a latere* into *France*, with power to reform, judge, collate, diſpenſe, or do ſuch other things, accuſtomed to be ſpecified in the authoritative bull of his legation, except it be upon the deſire, or with the approbation of the moſt Chriſtian King. Neither can the ſaid legate execute his charge, until he has promiſed the King in writing, under his oath, upon his holy orders, not to make uſe of his legantine power, in the King's dominions, longer than it ſhall pleaſe the King. And that ſo ſoon as he ſhall be admoniſhed of the King's pleaſure to forbid it,

it, he will give it over. And that whilſt he does uſe it, it ſhall be exerciſed conformable to the King's will, without attempting any thing to the prejudice of the decrees of general councils, or the liberties and privileges of the *Gallican* church, and the univerſities of *France*.

4. All bulls and miſſives, which came from *Rome* to *France*, are to be ſeen and viſited, to try if there be nothing in them prejudicial in any manner to the eſtate, and liberties of the church of *France*, or to the royal authority.

5. The courts of parliament, in caſe of appeals, as from abuſe, have right and power to declare null, void, and to revoke the Pope's bulls, and excommunications, and to forbid the execution of them, when they are found contrary to ſacred decrees, the liberties of the *French* church, or the prerogative royal.

6. General councils are above the Pope, and may depoſe him, and put another in his place, and take cognizance of appeals from the Pope.

7. All biſhops have their power immediately from Chriſt, not from the Pope,

Pope, and are equally ſucceſſors of St. *Peter*, and the other apoſtles and vicars of Chriſt.

8. The Pope cannot exempt any church, monaſtery, or eccleſiaſtical body, from the juriſdiction of their ordinary, nor erect biſhoprics into archbiſhoprics, nor unite them, nor divide them, without the King's licence.

As to *Germany*, he gives a full relation of the Emperor's calling ſynods, of reforming innovations by ſuch ſynods, of reforming the exceſſes of the *Roman* court, and other eccleſiaſtical innovations and abuſes.

As to the King of *Spain*, he ſays, That by himſelf and delegates, whom he ſubſtitutes, he judges, and puniſhes all eccleſiaſtical crimes, even in cardinals, which inhabit *Sicily*, he ſuffers no appeals to *Rome*, he admits no *nuncios* from *Rome*. That *Charles* V. *an.* 1534, renewed an edict of his predeceſſors at *Madrid:* That bulls, and miſſives ſent from *Rome*, ſhould be viſited, to ſee they contained nothing in them prejudicial to the crown, or church of *Spain*; which

which was ſtrictly obſerved within the *Spaniſh* dominions. That *Alexander Caſtracan* was diſgraced, and expelled out of *Spain*, for publiſhing the Pope's bulls, and that the papal cenſures were declared void; and that the Pope's delegates have been baniſhed out of that kingdom, for maintaining the privileges of the *Roman* court. The like he relates of *Flanders* and *Venice*.

Then, as to *England*, he ſays, The Kings of *England* in their great councils did make themſelves the laſt judges of the liberties, and grievances, and neceſſities of their people, even in caſes eccleſiaſtical; not the Pope. That the Pope could do nothing here, either againſt the canons, or beſides the canons. That the canons are no canons here, except they be received; and then adds, This ſame privilege was anciently radicated in the fundamental laws of *England*.

Let *Grotius*, in a few words conclude, who in the book cited above, ſays, That the King of *Great Britain* enjoys no power concerning things, and perſons eccle-

eccleſiaſtical, which the King of *Sicily* hath not alſo.

Here then, as to theſe two laſt queſtions, though I do not ſay, that according to our rules, they are, or may be laid aſide; yet if we take the opinion of theſe two great men, who made it their buſineſs to examine into this whole matter, and have evidence of *fact* to confirm their opinion, it muſt be owned, that all thoſe nations, which own the Pope, are provided with ſufficient power, and means, to maintain, defend, and ſecure all rights, liberties and privileges, both of church and ſtate; and that however pretending Popes have taken the advantage of weak and yielding Princes, yet that reſolute Princes have again recovered all ſuch rights, and that no ſuch nation need to ſuffer upon this account, but thoſe that will.

*Queſt.* X. Whether the biſhop of *Rome*, as prime patriarch, has power over all churches, or as patriarch of the Weſt, has any right of power over all weſtern churches?

Having conſidered ſo many queſtions concerning the Pope, there ſeems to be none, which need to obſtruct a catholic communion, but only this. And this according to the articles of our church, we cannot eaſily ſubſcribe. Now this whole controverſy being reduced to one ſingle queſtion, were it not to be wiſhed, that thoſe, in whom the authority of our church is lodged, would upon the motive of a general peace, and healing the wounds of divided Chriſtendom, ſee, if there be any poſſible accommodation to be found for this point?

It is certain there is none to be found for that univerſal, and unlimited ſupremacy, which ſome Popes have taken upon them. There is none to be found for thoſe encroachments of the Roman court, and its flatterers, by which they have endeavoured to ſubject both Princes, and national churches, to their arbitrary power. There is none to be found for that *univerſal epiſcopacy* claimed by *John* patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and condemned by *Gregory* the Great, as contrary to the goſpel, and a ſcandal

to

to the univerſal church. In this ſenſe to oppoſe the Pope, and his ſupremacy, muſt be the intereſt of all ſtates and churches; and there can be no cloſing with him herein, ſince we find not only the whole Gallican church, but likewiſe many other nations and princes, both with arguments and arms, reſolutely oppoſing this degree of unlimited ſupremacy, and notwithſtanding all the Roman thunder of excommunication and interdicts, have ſtood their ground, and ſtill been acknowledged to be in communion with that ſee; the queſtion is, whether there be any other primacy, or *limited ſupremacy*, in which for public peace, we may concur, while we oppoſe that which is unlimited with all the uſurpations and encroachments of it.

We find, that King *James* I. owned the Pope to be patriarch of the weſt, and the church of *Rome* to be our mother. Thus in a public *ſpeech* to his parliament, *an.* 1603. *I acknowledge*, ſaith he, *the church of* Rome *to be our mother church.* And in his *premonition* to

all Chriſtian monarchs: *Patriarchs, I know, were in the time of the primitive church, and I likewiſe reverence that inſtitution for order ſake: And for myſelf (if that were yet the queſtion) I would with all my heart give my conſent that the* Biſhop *of* Rome *ſhould have the firſt ſeat: I being a weſtern King would go with the patriarch of the weſt. And for his temporal principality over the ſignory of* Rome, *I do not quarrel it neither; let him in God his name be* Primus Epiſcopus inter Omnes Epiſcopos, *and* Princeps Epiſcoporum; *ſo it be no otherwiſe but as* Peter *was* Princeps Apoſtolorum. And with reſpect to this, we might conſider what he had there ſaid a little before about the *oath* of allegiance: *The lower houſe of parliament at the framing of this oath, made it to contain,* That the Pope had no power to excommunicate me: *which I cauſed them to reform; only making it to conclude,* That no excommunication of the Pope's can warrant my ſubjects to practiſe againſt my perſon or ſtate; *denying the depoſition of Kings to be in the Pope's lawful power; as indeed I take any ſuch temporal violence*

*violence to be far without the limits of ſuch a ſpiritual power as excommunication is.* The ſame in effect is in, *The due Way of compoſing the difference on foot, preſerving the church; according to the opinion of* Herbert Thorndike.

Now then the great queſtion is, concerning the primacy over all Chriſtendom. And here, ſince his Majeſty was for having the Pope to be as much over all other biſhops, as St. *Peter* was over all the other apoſtles, let us ſee how high the church of *England*, has ſet this ſuperiority of the chief apoſtle, in the *Collect* for his day: *O Almighty God, who by thy ſon* Jeſus Chriſt *didſt give to thy apoſtle Saint* Peter *many excellent gifts, and commandedſt him earneſtly* to feed thy flock; *make, we beſeech thee, all biſhops and paſtors diligently to preach thy holy word,* &c. Here St. *Peter*, among many excellent gifts, has his power founded upon thoſe words, *paſce agnos & oves*, as being then particularly commiſſioned to *feed the whole flock* of Chriſt. And it is in due proportion to this, that all other *biſhops* and *paſtors* are to *preach.* So alſo in the

*goſpel* for that day, we have St. *Peter's* glorious profeſſion occaſioned by our bleſſed ſaviour's queſtion put to his apoſtles, and a gracious *return* thereto: *He ſaith unto them, but whom ſay ye that I am? And* Simon Peter *anſwered and ſaid, Thou art Chriſt the ſon of the living God. And* Jeſus *anſwered and ſaid unto him, Bleſſed art thou* Simon Bar-jona: *for fleſh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I ſay alſo unto thee, that thou art* Peter, *and upon this rock I will build my church*; &c. Look then into the *Collects* and *Goſpels*, for the other apoſtles, and ſee whether this *honour* is there given to St. *Paul*, or to St. *James*, or to any elſe, whom humoriſts, and fanciful men, have at any time ſet up to ſtand in competition with St. *Peter*.

Some learned writers we have, who propoſe a catholic communion between all Chriſtian biſhops of the world, by joining with the biſhop of *Rome*, but ſeem not willing to allow more to him, than a *precedency of order*. Mr. *Thorndike*, before named, a learned man of our

our own church, ſeems to plead for a *pre-eminency of power*, and not only a precedency of rank, having been acknowledged originally in the church of *Rome*. *Epil.* l. 3. c. 20. p. 179. And *Spalatenſis* concurs herein. *De Rep. Eccl.* l. 4. c. 9. n. 1. 15. 16. And *Grotius* goes yet farther. It is well known, how induſtrious he was in examining into the root of all our diviſions, how zealous for compoſing them, and that he had a great advantage above thouſands, in propoſing means for bringing things to the concluſion of a happy and general peace. This great man thus qualified, in his laſt work, written not long before his death, makes this poſitive declaration, that there can be no hopes of uniting proteſtants, except they are firſt united with that church, which is in the communion with *Rome*; owning at the ſame time a kind of authoritative primacy in the Pope, which is the ground of that church's being united, and is no occaſion of the ſeparation, that has been made from it. I give his own words.

*Reſtitutionem Chriſtianorum in unum idemq; Corpus, ſemper optatam a Grotio, ſciunt, qui eum norunt. Exiſtimavit autem aliquando, incipi poſſe a proteſtantium inter ſe conjunctione. Poſtea vidit, id plane fieri nequire; quia, præterquam quod Calviniſtarum ingenia ferme omnium ab omni pace ſunt alieniſſima, proteſtantes nullo inter ſe communi eccleſiaſtico regimine ſociantur: Quæ cauſæ ſunt, cur facile partes in unum proteſtantium Corpus Colligi nequeant; immo & cur partes aliæ atque aliæ ſint exſurrecturæ. Quare nunc plane ita ſentit Grotius, & multi cum ipſo, non poſſe proteſtantes inter ſe jungi, niſi ſimul jungantur cum iis, qui ſedi Romanæ cohærent; ſine qua nullum ſperari poteſt in eccleſia commune regimen. Ideo optat, ut ea divulſio, quæ evenit, & cauſæ divulſionis tollantur. Inter eas cauſas non eſt primatus epiſcopi Romani ſecundum canones, fatente Melanchthone, qui eum primatum etiam neceſſarium putat ad retinendam unitatem.* Cloſe of laſt *Repl.* to *Rivet. Apol. Diſcuſs.* Which in Engliſh is thus rendered. "As many as know *Grotius*, know this of him, that he has always deſired that Chriſtians ſhould be again united into one and the ſame body.

dy. He was once of opinion that this might have been begun, by uniting proteſtants with one another; afterwards he ſaw this was impoſſible, not only becauſe the diſpoſition of the Calviniſts is averſe to peace, but, for that proteſtants have no common church-government, in which they are joined; which are the reaſons that the ſeveral diviſions of the proteſtants can never meet into one body, but ſtill more and more diviſions will be made. Wherefore *Grotius* is now abſolutely of this judgment, and many others concur with him in the ſame ſentiments, That proteſtants cannot be united among themſelves, except they are united together with thoſe who are in communion with the ſee of *Rome*. Hence it is his wiſh, that the ſeparation which has been made, and the cauſes of ſeparation, were taken away. Amongſt theſe cauſes, the primacy of the biſhop of *Rome*, according to the canons, is not to be reckoned; as *Melanchthon* likewiſe confeſſes; who is of opinion, that the primacy is even neceſſary for preſerving of unity." The ſame he had in part declared before, in his firſt re-

ply to *Rivet. ad art.* 7. *Quæ vero eſt cauſa, cur qui opinionibus diſſident inter catholicos, maneant eodum corpore non rupta communione; contra qui inter proteſtantes diſſident, idem facere nequeant, utcunque multa de dilectione paterna loquantur? Hoc qui rectè expenderit, inveniet quanta ſit vis primatus.* "What is the reaſon, *ſays he*, that thoſe among the catholics, who differ in opinion, ſtill remain in the ſame body, without breaking communion, and thoſe among the proteſtants, who diſagree, cannot do ſo, however they ſpeak much of brotherly love? Whoever will conſider this aright, will find how great is the effect of primacy."

This we have from *Grotius*, and it was as you ſee noted even in his legacy to divided Chriſtendom; directing them how their many unhappy ſchiſms are to be healed. In this he owns a primacy in the biſhop of *Rome*, and this not of *order* only, which is little more than honorary, ceremonial, and ineffectual; but ſuch as unites, prevents ſchiſms, is a *commune regimen*, a common government, is according to the canons, and has ſo much

much authority, that unity cannot be preſerved without it. He declares likewiſe, that ſuch a primacy according to the canons, has been no cauſe of dividing churches, and at the ſame time wiſhes, that all proteſtants would unite in the acknowledgment of ſuch authoritative primacy; ſo that it is evident, according to the judgment of this great man, there is ſuch a primacy, which thoſe of the reformation may own, and without which no catholic communion, no general peace of Chriſtendom, can be expected. I might have cited alſo *Melanchthon* himſelf in theſe words: *Quemadmodum ſunt aliqui epiſcopi qui præſunt pluribus eccleſiis*, &c. As certain biſhops preſide over many churches, ſo the biſhop of *Rome* is preſident over all biſhops. And this canonical policy no wiſe man, I think, does, or ought to diſallow. For the monarchy of the biſhop of *Rome*, is in my judgment, profitable to this end, that conſent of doctrine may be retained. Wherefore an agreement may eaſily be eſtabliſhed in this article of the Pope's ſupremacy, if other

other articles could be agreed upon. *Cent. Epiſt. Theol. Epiſt.* 74. Thus great men give their opinions in this matter, in which without propoſing any thing, I wiſh God would inſpire all concerned, to enquire into this matter; and laying aſide all prejudicial thoughts, reſolve upon making uſe of all expedients of peace, as far as juſtice and truth will give leave. For certainly, as it has been lately ſaid by a lover of unity, *Whatever lawfully may be done, ought to be done, for the healing of any ſchiſm.*

---

## CHAP. III.

### *Of the Invocation of Saints and Angels.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER the church of *Rome* teaches thoſe of her communion to forſake Chriſt, and not to truſt in him as their only mediator?

Upon a full enquiry made into this matter, I find thoſe of the church of *Rome* place their truſt and confidence in God,

God, and in the mediatorſhip of Chriſt, hoping for no ſalvation, but through the merits of his ſacred paſſion, in the ſame manner as we do in our church. This may be ſeen in the ordinary books of devotion, and inſtruction uſed by them, and particularly in thoſe books, which having been writ by them, we have reprinted for the common uſe of all in our church. Such are the *Following of Chriſt*, or *The Chriſtians Pattern*, by *Thomas a Kempis*: *F. Parſon's Directory*, or *Reſolutions*: *The Introduction to a Devout Life*: *Devotions after the Ancient Way of Offices*, with others, in which they teach all to put their whole truſt in God, through Chriſt. But this I found moſt fully delivered in *Roderiguez*, who (*Treat.* 3. of *Humil.* c. 33.) declares, that all the operations of grace in us, are freely added to us by God, who of objects of wrath, has made us his children. Not moved thereto by any former merits of ours, or in conſideration of future ſervices; *but by his own pure mercy, and the merits of our only mediator Jeſus Chriſt*, (theſe are his words.) Since according to the words of the apoſtle,

tle, *We are juſtified freely by the grace of God, and by the redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus.* And the ſame again in their *Catechiſm ad Parochos*, in which the paſtors of that church, are enjoined to inſtruct their flock in all that belongs to the myſteries of Chriſt's paſſion, in the effects and benefits of it to mankind. *Explic. Creed. Art.* 4. which article is thus concluded: I wiſh theſe myſteries were daily in our minds, that we may learn to ſuffer and die, and be buried together with our Lord; that ſo, all the filth of ſin being caſt off, we may riſe again together with him to a new life, and by his grace and mercy be at length made worthy to partake of his heavenly glory. And in the explication of the Lord's prayer, *Petit.* 5. *Par.* 25. Wherein the paſtor is thus ordered to teach his flock; *That we are not only debtors to God, but alſo, that we are not capable of diſcharging our debt; ſince a ſinner of himſelf is not able to make any ſatisfaction. Wherefore we muſt flee to the mercy of God; and becauſe his juſtice is equal to his mercy, therefore we muſt make uſe of the interceſſion, and patronage of the paſſion of our Lord* Jeſus Chriſt, *without*

*which*

*which none has ever obtained pardon of their ſins.* The ſame doctrine I find frequently delivered in the council of *Trent*. *Thoſe who are born of* Adam, *if they were not regenerated in Chriſt, could never be juſtified; ſince that grace, by which they are juſtified, is given them by the merit of his paſſion in whom we have redemption, and remiſſion of our ſins.* Seſſ. 6. c. 3. And again: *Believing in the firſt place, that by God, the ſinner is juſtified by his grace, through the redemption which is in* Chriſt Jeſus, *and turning themſelves to conſider the mercy of God, they are raiſed up in hope, confiding that God, through Chriſt, will be propitious to them, and then begin to love him, as the fountain of all righteouſneſs.* c. 6. Again in the firſt *Canon de Juſtific.* is this *Anathema* pronounced: *If any one ſhall ſay, that man is juſtified before God, by his own works, done either by the impulſe of nature, or the inſtruction of the law, without the divine grace, through* Jeſus Chriſt, *let him be anathema.* Many other places have I read of this kind in their own books, ſo plain and full, that I dare affirm it upon my own knowledge, that in this point there

there is no difference between the two churches, and that thoſe in communion with the Roman church, place as firm a confidence in Chriſt, and in the merits of his paſſion, confeſſing that nothing can be obtained but through him, as thoſe do of the reformation. *Segneri*, the famous Italian Jeſuit, may help to clear this point, who ſays, That if all the labours, tears, faſts and prayers of all the ſaints with the Bleſſed Virgin, and the blood of all the Martyrs were put together, they are not ſufficient to ſatisfy for the leaſt part of a mortal ſin, without the blood and paſſion of Chriſt. *Penit. Inſtruct.* p. 133. The charge then of forſaking Chriſt, as for all I can diſcover, is, *a conſequence* of ours from their calling upon the ſaints to pray for them, which many of our divines ſay, they cannot do, but by forſaking, or wronging the mediatorſhip of Chriſt. But this being a *conſequence, which they expreſsly diſown*, therefore, according to our fourth rule, it is what we ought never to charge upon them, and conſequently, it is a queſtion, which ought not to hinder communion.

nion. Now, that they *expreſsly diſown this conſequence*, is evident in the council of *Trent. Seſſ.* 25. *de Invoc.* Where acknowledging in St. *Paul's* words, *One mediator between God and Men, Chriſt Jeſus*, they condemn all thoſe, who ſay, that the invocation of ſaints is *injurious to the honour of this one mediator*, and expreſsly enjoin all paſtors to teach their flock, *that it is good and profitable to aſk the prayers of the ſaints for obtaining bleſſings of God, through* Jeſus Chriſt *his ſon, our Lord, who alone is our redeemer and ſaviour.*

*Queſt.* II. Whether there be not many phraſes and expreſſions in their ordinary prayer-books, in which they ſeem to confide in the ſaints, and injure the mediatorſhip of Chriſt?

The general and moſt authentic addreſs to the ſaints is only this, *Pray for us:* And whatever other expreſſions are found in their books, ſince they mean no more, as they declare themſelves, than to beg the prayers of the ſaints, and declare their abhorrence of all that is injurious to the mediatorſhip of Chriſt, hence the difficulty here comes to no more than

about

about *words* and *phraſes*: And ſince, according to our third rule, ſuch quarrels ought not to be advanced, but laid by, by all lovers of peace, hence this queſtion ought not to be made an exception againſt communion, eſpecially too, ſince their church obliges none to make uſe of ſuch books, wherein ſuch expreſſions are; and therefore being not impoſed by the church, according to our ſecond rule, this queſtion is not to obſtruct a common peace.

*Queſt.* III. Whether thoſe in communion with the ſee of *Rome*, do not pray more to the ſaints, but eſpecially to the Virgin *Mary*, than to God?

I have made a very particular enquiry into this matter, and find, that throughout their whole *Miſſal* (which is their book of divine ſervice) and *Breviary*, (which is their daily office, or devotion of their prieſts) there is not one *collect* or *prayer* to any one ſaint whatever, but every one is expreſsly directed to God, and all ending with the ſame concluſion as we have, *Through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt thy Son.* On all *Sundays* in the year, their *Collects* are generally the very ſame with

with ours; on St. *Michael*'s day the *Collect* is the ſame, and on the *Saints days*, the *Collects* are ever addreſſed to God, and only begging, that by the prayers and interceſſions of the Saints, may be granted what they aſk, but ſtill concluding their whole petition with their confidence in Jeſus Chriſt, *Through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* So that in the ſolemn worſhip of the church, at which all are obliged to be preſent, it cannot be obſerved, that they directly deſire the prayer of any Saints, except only in the *Confiteor*, which is very ſhort, and in the *Litanies*, which are ſaid only twice in the whole year; and even then the people are not obliged to be preſent at them.

Beſides theſe books of ſolemn or public worſhip, they have a *private devotion* of the *Roſary*, in which there are ten *Hail Marys* for one *Lord's Prayer*. This is indeed approved, but no where commanded by the church: Nor is it impoſed on any ever to ſay it throughout their whole lives. And even in the direction for ſuch as think fit to ſay it, I find particular inſtructions given for per-

performing that devotion, in memory of Chriſt's incarnation, and of the principal myſteries of his death and paſſion. But this I undertake not here to juſtify; it is enough to anſwer my purpoſe, that it is not impoſed on any by that church: but thoſe who are of that communion, are equally at liberty of never uſing it, with others, that are out of it: Hence according to our ſecond rule, though it were a corrupt practice, yet it ought not to obſtruct communion.

*Queſt.* IV. Whether there be not great abuſes in the church of *Rome*, in relation to the Saints, by drawing the people from their due dependence on Chriſt, and by confiding ſo much in their interceſſion, as to neglect the ways of repentance, upon preſumption of their prevailing prayers?

It is very likely there are many abuſes of this kind; but ſince theſe abuſes are no where impoſed on the members of that church; ſince they are not approved by her; nay, ſince ſhe has expreſly recommended to the prelates to be

be watchful in taking away all ſuperſtition in the invocation of Saints, and other abuſes in keeping of their holy-days, *Conc. Tr. Seſſ.* 25. *de invoc.* Since the Catechiſms, and other books publiſhed by authority, mention theſe very abuſes, and condemn them with as much ſeverity as any of our church can poſſibly do; as may be ſeen in the *Spiritual Director*, tranſlated from the French, *ch.* 24. And in the Catechiſm of the *Four French Biſhops, Part* 6. *Art.* 2. *leſſ.* 8. in which are ſet down the abuſes to be avoided in the invocation of Saints, and in the devotion to the Virgin *Mary*. Since, I ſay, the abuſes whatever they be of this kind, are diſapproved by the authority of that church, and her ſeveral paſtors, theſe, according to our ſecond rule, ought not to be made an objection againſt communion.

*Queſt.* V. Whether it be lawful to deſire the Saints in Heaven to pray for us?

In this whole matter of the invocation of Saints, this is the only ſingle point, which wants to be accommodated between

tween the two churches. For this is the only thing the church in communion with *Rome*, has declared in the council of *Trent*. *Bonum atque utile eſſe, Sanctos una cum Chriſto regnantes ſuppliciter invocare.* That it is good and profitable to call upon the Saints.

Now, that this doctrine ſhould be condemned, as it ſtands under all its abuſes, ſuperſtitions, and incommodious explications, as *Grotius* terms them; as it is injurious to the mediation of Chriſt, and gives people a confidence of ſalvation, without due care for amendment of their ſinful lives; that it ſhould be thus condemned, I do not wonder; neither can it be expected, or deſired, we ſhould ever cloſe with it, ſince it would be as eaſy to renounce all religion, as to approve, and ſubſcribe what is not conſiſtent with the mediation of Chriſt.

But whatever were, or are the abuſes of this practice in the church of *Rome*, ſince they come ſo far towards us, as to declare againſt all ſuch abuſes, and enjoin a reformation of them. Since they join with us in holding to the one mediator

diator Jeſus Chriſt. Since they abſolutely declare to their people, *That it is abſolutely neceſſary for them to place their whole confidence in* Jeſus Chriſt, *becauſe as the holy ſcripture declares, there is no ſalvation by any other, but through him*; as it is taught in the Catechiſm of the Four Biſhops now cited; ſince they aſk of the Saints in Heaven to become petitioners together with them, as they deſire the ſame of their brethren on earth, and with the ſame confidence in *Jeſus Chriſt*; knowing that nothing can be obtained by the juſt in Heaven, or on earth, but through the mediation of his paſſion. Since I ſay, this doctrine is propoſed with this moderation, and with theſe reſtraints, the queſtion is, Whether under theſe terms, there can be any hopes of accommodating it, upon the conſideration of a public peace.

So far I have encouragement, that I find a learned and zealous prelate of our own church, not only favouring, but even approving it, and pleading for it, *viz.* biſhop *Montague* of *Chicheſter*, and afterwards of *Norwich*.

1. He

1. He owns, that the Saints in heaven pray for the faithful on earth. *I do not deny*, ſays he, *but the Saints are mediators, as they are called of prayer, and interceſſion, but in general, and for all in general. They interpoſe with God by their ſupplications, and mediate by their prayers.* Antid. p. 20. I know many others join with him, and in this mediation, expound that article of our *Creed, Communion of Saints.*

2. He owns, that the bleſſed in heaven, do recommend to God in their prayers, their kindred, friends, and acquaintance on earth. And having given his reaſons for this, he inſerts this declaration: *This is the common voice with general concurrence, without contradiction of reverend and learned antiquity, for ought I ever could read, or underſtand: And I ſee no cauſe or reaſon to diſſent from them, touching interceſſion in this kind.* Treat. Invoc. of Saints, p. 103.

3. He owns alſo, that it is no injury to the mediation of Chriſt, to aſk of the Saints to pray for us. *Indeed I grant*, ſays he, *Chriſt is not wronged in his mediation;*

*ation*; *it is no impiety to ſay, as they* (of the Roman Church) *do*; *Holy* Mary *pray for me*. *Holy* Peter *pray for me*. *ib.* p. 118. And going on upon this ſubject of the Bleſſed in heaven, in the next page he ſays, *Could I come at them, or certainly inform them of my ſtate, without any queſtion, or more ado, I would readily, and willingly ſay, Holy* Peter, *Bleſſed* Paul, *pray for me*; *recommend my caſe unto Chriſt Jeſus our Lord. Were they with me, by me, in my kenning, I would run with open arms, and* γονυπετῶν, *fall upon my knees, and with affection, deſire them to pray for me.* And p. 97. *I ſee no abſurdity in nature, no incongruity unto analogy of faith, no repugnancy at all to ſacred ſcripture, much leſs, impiety, for any man to ſay, Holy angel guardian, pray for me.*

In theſe terms this prelate, writing profeſſedly upon this ſubject, ſeems to approve this whole doctrine; and the only difficulty he makes in the practice, is becauſe he does not apprehend how the ſaints ſhall come to the knowledge of the petitions made to them. But ſince the holy ſcripture tells us that

there is joy in heaven at the converſion of a ſinner; which ſhews that Saints and Angels, though we cannot tell by what means, do certainly know it. Since I find St. *Auguſtin* (*lib. de Cur. pro Mort. c.* 26.) moving the ſame difficulty, and confeſſing it above the reach of his judgment, to know how the martyrs relieve thoſe who call upon them; and yet owning at the ſame time, that they do certainly aſſiſt them, and do intercede for ſuch as call upon them. Since this difficulty did not diſcourage the practice in his time, of begging their prayers, nor render ſuch practice uſeleſs; it may be hoped, notwithſtanding the difficulty, there may be means found by thoſe in authority, for accommodating this point at preſent: And that while ſo eminent a prelate of our own church, went ſo far, and juſtified what he had writ, againſt all oppoſers, it may be a motive for removing preſent objections, that ſo this point may not be an obſtruction to that general peace, which is ſo much deſired.

CHAP.

## CHAP. IV.

### *Of Images.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER the church of *Rome* teaches thoſe in her communion, to pray to images?

I have fully examined into this point, and find there is no ſuch thing taught by the council of *Trent*, nor in their profeſſion of faith, nor in their Catechiſms publiſhed for the inſtruction of the people. On the contrary, the council of *Trent* declares, *There is no divinity nor virtue in the images of Chriſt, or the Virgin* Mary, *for which they are to be worſhipped; and that nothing is to be aſked of them, nor any confidence to be placed in them; as was formerly done by the heathens, who truſted in their idols.* Seſſ. 25. de **Invoc.** And in their Catechiſms I ſee the queſtion is aſked, *Whether Catholics pray to images?* and 'tis poſitively anſwered, *No, they do not:* And this reaſon is added, *Becauſe they neither can ſee, nor hear, nor help us.* If then any can be ſuppoſed ſo ſtupid,

as at any time to have done it, yet ſince that church is ſo far from teaching it, that ſhe teaches the contrary, therefore this queſtion ought not to be preſſed, as any obſtruction to the catholic communion.

*Queſt.* II. Whether there be not ſome expreſſions in their hymns, and eſpecially thoſe relating to the croſs, which import as much as a prayer?

I have ſeen ſuch expreſſions, though very few, which being in *hymns*, ſeem to me no more than poetical liberties; ſuch are uſual in *canticles*, and are found in ſcripture: As *Deut.* 32. 1. where *Moſes* ſpeaks to the *heavens* and to the *earth*. And while thoſe in that communion, poſitively declare, they are no more than figurative expreſſions, and their church declares, that no images ought to be prayed to, it ſeems reaſonable to expound their hymns by their profeſſed doctrine, and not on the contrary; ſince no religion, nor book, nor even the ſcripture, can ſtand the teſt, of maintaining all that for profeſſed doctrine, which can be inferred from its literal

literal expreſſions: It being certain in many inſtances, that the *letter killeth*. But if this be not reaſon enough for waving this queſtion, yet from our ſecond rule, it ought to be laid by; ſince that church impoſes not the ſaying thoſe hymns on any of the flock, but they may be all their lives in that communion, without ever once repeating them.

*Queſt.* III. Whether thoſe in communion with the Roman church, are not idolaters in the worſhipping of images?

I have ſtrictly enquired into this point, and by all I can obſerve both in their councils, profeſſions of faith, catechiſms, ſpiritual books, and other books of devotion, I cannot ſee, but they as firmly believe in one only God, as we do in the church of *England*; and with as much conſtancy declare, That the honour of God ought not to be given to another. The whole body of their devotions and breviary, is compoſed of *David*'s Pſalms; in which is the ſo frequent confeſſion of one God, and confuſion pronounced againſt all worſhipping of idols. Hence they repeat every

week the 97th Pſalm, *v.* 7. in theſe words: *Confundantur omnes qui adorant ſculptilia, & qui gloriantur in ſimulachris ſuis. Confounded be all they that ſerve graven images, that boaſt themſelves of idols.* Every *Sunday* at even-ſong, they repeat *Pſalm* 115; in which they profeſs one God, reproach idols, for being the work of mens hands, for having eyes and ſeeing not, for having ears and hearing not; and then go on with this verſe, *Similes illis fiant, qui faciunt ea, & omnes qui confidunt in eis.* Which in their verſion is more than ours, even an imprecation or wiſh, *That all men may become like them, who make them, and put their truſt in them.* From all which I muſt conclude, That all the charge of idolatry, is only a conſequence of ours, and ſuch as they expreſsly diſown, I may ſay abhor, and therefore, according to our fourth rule, ought not to be inſiſted on as an obſtruction to communion; eſpecially, ſince that church impoſes on none the uſe of any images, but leaves all its members at liberty of uſing them, if they think fit, or of

wholly

wholly letting them alone, which, according to our ſecond rule, is motive enough for waving this queſtion, ſince whatever the idolatry be, they oblige none to be guilty of it.

*Queſt.* IV. Whether thoſe in the *Roman* communion, are not taught to honour and worſhip graven images?

I have with great application examined into this point, and the reſult of my enquiry is this: I find their council of *Trent*, declares (and 'tis the ſame in their profeſſion of faith) that *due honour* (or the honour which is due) *and veneration, is to be given to the images of Chriſt.* This is a very large expreſſion, and cannot well be excepted againſt, while it approves no more than is *due.* And having conſidered their ſeveral explications of this *honour*, I find it comes to no more than this; that is, ſuch honour as is generally thought due to all holy things, which have any *eminent*, or *particular relation to God, or to his worſhip and ſervice:* Such as was due formerly to the ark of the Teſtament, or to the temple; ſuch as is now judged due to

the name of *Jēſus*, to the *Altar*, to the *Books of the Goſpels*, to *Holy Veſſels*, to the *Sacramental Bread*, to the *Church*, to the *Miniſters of the Altar*. Such honour as this, is what, in the *Roman* church, is judged due to the images of Chriſt. Which being proper for moving pious affections, and raiſing devotion, are numbered amongſt things conſecrated to God's ſervice.

As to the honour given to the name of *Jeſus*, ſee Queen *Elizabeth*'s Injunctions, *an.* 1559; where 'tis enjoined, *That whenſoever the name of* Jeſus *ſhall be in any Leſſon, Sermon, or otherwiſe in the church pronounced, due reverence be made of all perſons young and old, with lowneſs of courteſy, and uncovering of heads of the mankind, as* thereunto *doth* neceſſarily belong, *and heretofore hath been* accuſtomed. Reinforced by the *canons* under King *James* I. *an.* 1663. And ſurely ſince this pronounced *name* is the ſame to the ear, that the *image* is to the eye, whatever reverence is lawfully given to one, may be as lawfully given to the other.

Arch-

Archbiſhop *Laud* was for reverence, not only *before, and towards,* but *to* the *altar*; in his *ſpeech* in the *Star-Chamber*, the 14th of *June*, 1637. And it may not be amiſs to obſerve how he there addreſſed the *Lords* of the *Garter*: *I hope* ſaith he, *a poor Prieſt may* worſhip God *with as lowly* reverence *as you do, ſince you are* bound *by your* order *and by your* oath, *according to a* conſtitution *of* Henry *the Fifth, (as appears in* Libro Nigro Windeſorenſi) *to give due* honour and reverence, Domino Deo, & altari ejus, in modum virorum eccleſiaſticorum; *That is, to the* Lord your God, *and to his* altar; *(for there is a* reverence *due to that too, though ſuch as comes far ſhort of* divine worſhip) *and this in the* manner, *as* eccleſiaſtical perſons *both* worſhip, *and do* reverence. *p.* 49. Now if this honour may be allowed to the very *altar*, why not to the *images* of Chriſt, and in proportion too, to thoſe of Saints?

I muſt confeſs, the ſchoolmen, in explicating this honour, have, by their ſubtilties, raiſed ſeveral queſtions, ſuch as perplex, inſtead of clearing the point:

As, Whether this honour be a religious honour? Whether it be properly adoration, or worſhip? Whether it be the ſame that is given to the things repreſented, or inferior to it, with other like? And theſe ſeveral opinions, have furniſhed matter for very plauſible objections: But when all is conſidered, the caſe appears very evident, that all ſuch difficulties and objections ſo moved, are only diſputes about *terms* and *words*, having equal force with relation to all the other holy things, now mentioned, as to the images of Chriſt. And therefore, I think, without wronging the cauſe of either ſide, they may be all laid by, according to our third rule, and not to be made any longer, an objection againſt a general peace. And for this, I have the famous *Grotius* to ſtrengthen my ſentiments. Who ſpeaking of the uſe of images, concludes thus: *Truly if in this diſquiſition, ambiguous words, (which by their various acceptation, diſtract the minds of men) were ſet aſide (namely, invocation, adoration, worſhip, religion, honour): And if in things themſelves, the indifferent*

*different were diſtinguiſhed from the unlawful, there would be fewer ſeeds of contention.* Appendix out of Vote for the church's peace.

*Queſt.* V. Whether there has not been, and are great abuſes in relation to images in the church of *Rome*, at leaſt amongſt the more ignorant, who ſeem to place a confidence in them, and believe a thouſand ridiculous miracles of them, by which the images become injurious to God?

*Grotius* was of opinion, that in the uſe of images, the mean has been exceeded by many. And the council of *Trent* ſeems to ſuppoſe many abuſes, and ſuperſtitions to have crept in amongſt the people, which ought to be reformed. But however, ſince ſuch abuſes and ſuperſtitious practices, are ſo far from being approved, that they are condemned by the ſaid council, and order is given to the prelates of removing all ſuch abuſes, and tolerating no ſort of images, which can be the occaſion of error to the people, and of admitting no ſort of miracles to be publiſhed, but

what,

what, upon due examination, they ſhall approve. *Seſſ.* 25. *de Invoc.* Hence by our ſecond rule, this queſtion ought to be caſt by, ſince any one may communicate with that church, without partaking in ſuch ſinful practices.

*Queſt.* VI. Whether it be not a ſuperſtitious practice ſtill kept up to this Day, in worſhipping the croſs on *Good Friday*, and kiſſing it on the knees?

It certainly looks ſo. But ſince they poſitively declare that by this outward action, they intend no more but to expreſs that love and veneration, which is due to the croſs, as to other holy things, and to their Redeemer, who on that day died for them; in this ſenſe it comes to be no more than if one ſhould with bended knees in the ſame manner kiſs the book of the Goſpel, in acknowledgment and thankſgiving of Chriſt preaching the Goſpel of Salvation. It is no more, than if we ſhould not only *bow our body to the holy altar, but fall flat on our faces before his footſtool, ſo ſoon as ever we come in ſight thereof*; for in this Caſe, ſays Dr. *Pocklington, what apoſtle*

or

*or father would condemn us for it, and not rather be delighted to ſee the Lord ſo honoured?* Sun. no Sab. 'Tis no more, than if being upon Mount *Calvary*, on *Good-Friday*, we ſhould poſtrate ourſelves, and on our knees kiſs the ground where the croſs ſtood. A grateful acknowledgment of faith and love is due to our Redeemer, in a moſt ſpecial manner, on that day of our redemption; and if inſtead of Mount *Calvary*, we ſhould humble ourſelves to the ground, and kiſs the croſs, ſo to expreſs this our acknowledgment of love to Chriſt, I cannot but hope it might be done without being idolatry, however it might look to others, who through ignorance might take exceptions at it. Theſe are the explications given by the *Romaniſts* of this *Good Friday* ceremony. But I am not concerned in juſtifying their reaſons; 'tis enough for my preſent purpoſe, that the performing this ceremony is not enjoined by that church, on the people; and therefore, if the practice be not warrantable, yet ſince it is not impoſed, according to our ſecond rule, this ought not to obſtruct communion.

*Queſt.*

*Queſt.* VII. Whether it be not a ſinful practice to paint the Trinity, and repreſent God the Father as an old man; ſince this muſt be an occaſion of notorious error to the ignorant, in making them believe, that God is corporeal, and has the likeneſs of his creatures?

The church of *Rome* believes, and teaches the ſame as we do, as to God; that he is infinite, incorporeal, a pure ſpirit, and that it is not poſſible to repreſent him as he is, under any figure, to human eyes. But as the whole Chriſtian world repreſents the *Holy Ghoſt* (though equally a pure ſpirit with the Father) in the form of a Dove, becauſe in that form he has ſhewn himſelf viſible to men; ſo thoſe of the *Roman* church ſometimes repreſent *God the Father*, under the form of an old man, becauſe in this form he was ſeen by *Daniel* in his viſion, *Dan.* 7. 9. where he ſaw the *Ancient of Days, ſitting on the throne, whoſe garment was white as ſnow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool.* And for preventing any errors being occaſioned in the ignorant by ſuch pictures,

the

the council of *Trent* gives expreſs orders to the paſtors to teach the people, that they are not to imagine, the Divinity can be expreſſed in colours, or any created ſimilitude, for that it is wholly inviſible to corporeal eyes. And therefore, whatever this practice be, whether warrantable or no, yet ſince that church is ſo far from propoſing it, as injurious to the divinity of God, that it is ſolicitous to prevent all ſuch errors; hence, according to our ſecond rule, this queſtion may be laid by, and not be made an occaſion of obſtructing communion.

*Queſt.* VIII. Whether there be any thing in this point of the images of Chriſt, and his ſaints, which may not be reconciled between the two churches?

Whatever ſuperſtitious practices or abuſes there are amongſt the ignorant, or others, in this point, cannot be approved; but ſince the church of *Rome* approves them not, earneſtly deſires their reformation, as it is in the council of *Trent*: *Eas prorſus aboleri ſancta ſynodus vehementer cupit*. *Seſſ.* 25. In this the two churches are agreed, and there is

no

no need of quitting the one, and going to the other, for diſapproving and condemning all ſuch abuſes and ſuperſtitious practices.

But as to the doctrinal point, as it is delivered by the moderate ones of the church of *Rome*, and is ſufficient for communion, though our church has never in terms aſſented to it; yet I find eminent paſtors of it allowing it ſo far, as even the other ſide requires, and this may be a great ſtep towards the accommodation of it.

1. The hiſtorical uſe of pictures is allowed by all.

2. A religious uſe of them is allowed by ſome, as they help to raiſe our affections, and move our devotion. Biſhop *Montague* ſpeaking of holy images, declares his thoughts in theſe words: Nor are they utterly and abſolutely unlawful for any religious employment. Our ſtricteſt writers do not condemn or cenſure St. *Gregory*, for putting upon them that hiſtorical uſe of ſuggeſting unto, moving, or affecting the mind, even in pious and religious affections.

For

For inſtance, in remembering more feelingly, and ſo being empaſſioned more effectually with the death, bloodſhed, and bitter paſſion of our Saviour, when we ſee that hiſtory fully and lively repreſented unto us in colours, or worked by a ſkilful hand. *Appeal. l.* 21. And Dr. *Pocklington* joins in this with the Biſhop.

3. A reſpect and honour is allowed them by the ſame prelate. The pictures of Chriſt, the bleſſed Virgin, and Saints, may be made, had in houſes, ſet up in churches; the proteſtants uſe them; they deſpight them not. Reſpect and honour may be given unto them; the proteſtants do it, and uſe them for helps of piety, in rememoration, and more effectual repreſentation of the prototype. *Gagger. p.* 318. and *Appeal. c.* 21. In the contents, he ſays, that images may affect the minds of religious men, by repreſenting unto them the actions of Chriſt and his Saints: In which regard, ſays he, all reverence ſimply cannot be abſtracted from them.

Now

Now if this honour can be allowed to be ſuch as is given to holy things, as holy veſſels, churches, the book of the goſpel, &c. There's no need of more for this point's being accommodated, ſince this is enough for communicating with the *Roman* church, with a liberty likewiſe of terming it religious or not religious, as every one ſhall think beſt, there being no reſtraint as to theſe terms.

---

## CHAP. V.

### *Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Real Preſence, Tranſubſtantiation.*

*Queſt.* 1. WHETHER the *Romaniſts* are not idolaters in worſhipping the bread and wine?

If they worſhip the bread and wine as God, and thus require it to be done by all in communion with them, this would certainly be a juſt motive for not communicating with them or their church. But upon examination, I find their declaration to be unanimous in this point; that however they are taught to worſhip

worſhip the ſacrament, yet this only is underſtood of *res ſacramenti*, that is, the adoration of Chriſt in the ſacrament. According to what is defined in the council of *Trent*. *Can.* 6. *Si quis dixerit in ſancto euchariſtiæ ſacramento Chriſtum unigenitum Dei filium non eſſe cultu latriæ etiam externo adorandum, anathema ſit.* Chriſt then being ſolemnly profeſſed by them to be the object of their worſhip in the euchariſt, and not the elements of bread and wine, our charge of idolatry upon them, ſeems no more, than a conſequence of ours from our principles, and not theirs, and ſuch as they diſown, I may ſay deteſt, and therefore, according to our fourth rule, ought not to be made the occaſion of a ſeparate communion.

*Queſt.* II. Whether there be not ſo many abſurdities, and contradictions both to ſenſe and reaſon, in the doctrine of the real preſence, as taught by the Romaniſts, that it is impoſſible to be reconciled?

So it certainly ſeems to many; and yet I do not find, in the judgment of the refor-

reformation, that the belief of the *real preſence*, is ſufficient cauſe for ſeparating communion. The *Lutherans* believe a real preſence, and yet are proteſtants; and notwithſtanding this their belief, the *Calviniſts* in *France*, in a national ſynod *An.* 1631. declared their union with the *Lutherans*, and admitted them to communion. And by what I obſerve, even *Calvin* and other great men of the reformation, ſeem to aſſert the ſame doctrine with the church of *Rome*, as to the real preſence. *Calvin* upon 1. *Cor.* 11. 24. *Take, eat, this is my body*, ſays thus: *Neque enim mortis tantum, & reſurrectionis ſuæ beneficium offert Chriſtus, ſed corpus ipſum, in quo paſſus eſt, & reſurrexit. Neither does Chriſt offer us the benefit only of his death, and reſurrection, but that very body itſelf, in which he ſuffered, and roſe again.* *Beza*, with others, as related by *Hoſpinian. Hiſt. Sacram. part. altera*, p. 251. *Fatemur in cœna Domini, non modo omnia Chriſti beneficia, ſed ipſam etiam filij hominis ſubſtantiam, ipſam, inquam, veram carnem, & verum illum, ſanguinem, quem fudit pro nobis, non ſignificati duntaxat, aut*

*ſymbolice,*

*ſymbolice, typice, vel figurate proponi, tanquam abſentis memoriam; ſed vere ac certo repreſentari, exhiberi & applicanda offerri, adjunctis ſymbolis minime nudis, ſed quæ (quod ad Deum ipſum promittentem & offerrentem attinet) ſemper rem ipſam vere, ac certo conjunctam habeant, ſive fidelibus, ſive infidelibus proponantur. Ut appareat nos ipſius corporis, & ſanguinis Chriſti præſentiam in cœna retinere, & defendere.* Here, they ſay, the preſence is not figurative, or typical, but that the very thing itſelf is joined with the ſymbols.

Likewiſe, I find the doctrine of the real preſence in terms aſſerted by our own church, and the eminent members thereof. Thus what can be more poſitive and clear, than thoſe words in the *Catechiſm*, where to the queſtion, *What is the inward part or thing ſignified?* It is anſwered, *the body and blood of Chriſt, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.* Here the *faithful* are the communicants, and they do here participate of the very *body* and *blood*; even in diſtinction to the *fruits* thereof, which are the ſubject of the

the next queſtion: *What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?* So alſo in delivering the ſacrament in the *Communion-office*, it is ſaid, the *body of our Lord*, &c. and *the blood of our Lord*, &c. Nor ought the additional, *take*, &c. to be now thought any abatement of the *verity* of the thing, unleſs we condemn the leaving it out in the new *liturgy* made for the church of *Scotland*, and authorized by his Majeſty, *anno* 1636.

Queen *Elizabeth* was ſo fixed upon the real preſence, that ſhe ſuffered not her faith to be ſhocked therein. She determined the caſe in theſe following verſes:

*'Twas God the Word that ſpake it,*
*He took the bread and brake it,*
*And what the Word did make it,*
*That I believe and take it.*

And in her reign, Mr. *Hooker* in his *Eccl. Pol.* l. 5. ſaid, the different opinions of the ſacrament thus far accord in one, that theſe holy myſteries received in due manner, do inſtrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that body and blood, which were given for

the

the life of the world; and beſides alſo impart unto us, even in a true, and real, though myſtical manner, the very perſon of our Lord himſelf, whole, perfect and entire.

What King *James* I. and biſhop *Andrews* believed in this point, may be ſeen in the *Anſwer* to Card. *Bellarmin*'s Apology, c. 1. *De hoc eſt, fide firma tenemus, quod ſit. Præſentiam, inquam, credimus, nec minus quam vos, veram.* We believe a true preſence as much as you. And we have the ſame in *Caſaubon*'s Letter, written alſo by the King's command to Card. *Perron.*

Biſhop *Montague's Appeal* may be next ſeen, chapter 30. The contents of which is thus: A real preſence maintained by us. The difference betwixt us, and popiſh writers, is only about the *modus* of Chriſt's preſence in the bleſſed ſacrament. Agreement is likely to be made, but for the factions and unquiet ſpirits on both ſides. *Beati Pacifici.* And in the body of the Chapter, he ſpeaks thus to the informers his adverſaries: The *real preſence* in your divinity

is

is flat popery, but not in the divinity of the church of *England*. Concerning this point I ſaid, and I ſay ſo ſtill, that if men were diſpoſed as they ought, unto peace, there need be no difference. And I added a reaſon, which I repeat again here: The diſagreement is only in *de modo preſentiæ*. The thing is yielded to on either ſide, that there is in the holy euchariſt a real preſence. God forbid, ſaith biſhop *Bilſon*, we ſhould deny, that the fleſh and blood of Chriſt are truly preſent, and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's table. It is the doctrine that we teach others, and comfort ourſelves withal. And the reverend and learned anſwerer unto *Bellarmin*'s Apology cometh home to the faith, or popery if you will, condemned in M. *Montague*, who learnt it of him, and ſuch as he is. *Nobis vobiſcum de objecto convenit, de modo lis eſt. Præſentiam, inquam, credimus, non minus quam vos, veram; de modo preſentiæ nil temere definimus.* And to them agreeth biſhop *Morton*. The queſtion is not concerning a real preſence, which proteſtants do alſo profeſs.

feſs. *Fortunatus* a proteſtant holding that Chriſt is in the ſacrament moſt really, *veriſſime realiſſimeque* are his words. In theſe words does biſhop *Montague* declare, and defend his belief of the real preſence.

Archbiſhop *Laud*, beſides what was noted from him before, out of his *ſpeech* in the Star-chamber, gives there alſo this reaſon drawn from the real preſence, for *reverence* to the *altar*, as being upon this account the greateſt place of God's *reſidence* upon earth. I ſay, ſaith he, the greateſt, yea greater than the *pulpit*. For *there* it is *hoc eſt corpus meum*, this is my body. But in the *pulpit*, it is at moſt but *hoc eſt verbum meum*, this is my word. And a greater reverence (no doubt) is *due* to the *body*, than to the *word* of our *Lord*. And ſo in *relation*, anſwerably to the *throne*, where his *body* is uſually *preſent*, than to the *ſeat*, whence his *word* uſeth to be *proclaimed*. p. 47. And elſewhere in his *Confer. with Fiſher*. §. 35. n. 6. punct. 4. he quotes biſhop *Ridley*'s confeſſion ſet down by *Fox*. p. 1598. in thoſe words: You (the papiſts) and I

agree in this, that in the ſacrament is the very true and *natural* body and blood of *Jeſus Chriſt*, even that which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, which aſcended into Heaven, which ſits on the right hand of God the Father, *&c.* only we differ in the way and manner of being there. Add to theſe biſhop *Ken*'s Expoſition, licenſed 1685. O God incarnate, how thou canſt give us thy fleſh to eat, and thy blood to drink; how thy fleſh is meat indeed; how thou, who art in heaven art preſent on the altar, I can by no means explain, but I firmly believe it all, becauſe thou haſt ſaid it, and I firmly rely on thy love, and on thy omnipotence, to make good thy word, though the manner of doing it, I cannot comprehend.

## SECT. I.

### *Of the Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt.*

FOR explication of this belief of Chriſt's real preſence, ſome go ſo far, as

to

to declare, that he ought to be adored in the euchariſt.

Biſhop *Andrews*, as above, *ch.* 8. *p.* 194. *Rex Chriſtum in euchariſtia vere præſentem, vere & adorandum ſtatuit.* And, *Nos vero in myſterijs carnem Chriſti adoramus cum Ambroſio*, &c. The king (he ſpeaks of King *James* I.) acknowledges Chriſt to be truly preſent, and truly to be adored in the euchariſt. I alſo with St. *Ambroſe*, adore the fleſh of Chriſt in the myſteries.

Biſhop *Forbes de Euchariſtia*, l. 2. c. 2. § 9. *An Chriſtus in euchariſtia ſit adorandus, proteſtantes ſaniores non dubitant. In ſumptione enim euchariſtiæ adorandus eſt Chriſtus vera latria.* And, § 8. *Immanis eſt rigidorum proteſtantium error, qui negant Chriſtum in euchariſtia eſſe adorandum, niſi adoratione interna & mentali, non autem, externo aliquo ritu adorativo, ut in geniculatione, aut aliquo alio conſimili corporis ſitu; hi fere omnes male de præſentia Chriſti Domini in ſacramento, miro ſed vero modo, præſentis, ſentiunt.* The ſounder proteſtants, make no doubt of adoring Chriſt in the euchariſt. For in receiving the eucha-

riſt, Chriſt is to be adored with true *Latria*. It is a monſtrous error of the rigid proteſtants, who deny that Chriſt is to be adored in the euchariſt, except only with an inward adoration of the mind, but not with any outward act of adoration; as kneeling, or other like poſture of the body. All theſe do not believe aright of the preſence of Chriſt in the ſacrament; preſent there, after a wonderful, but real manner.

Mr. *Thorndike*, *Epil.* l. 3. c. 30. p. 350. I ſuppoſe, ſays he, the body and blood of Chriſt may be adored, whereſoever they are; and muſt be adored by a good chriſtian, where the cuſtom of the church, which a chriſtian is obliged to communicate with, requires it. And is not the preſence thereof in the ſacrament of the euchariſt, a juſt occaſion preſently to expreſs by that bodily act of adoration, that inward honour, which we always carry towards our Lord Chriſt, as God? *p.* 351. Not to baulk that freedom, ſays he, which hath carried me to publiſh all this; I do believe that it was ſo practiſed, and done in the antient church,

church, and in the ſymbols, before receiving: which I maintain from the beginning, to have been the true church of Chriſt, obliging all to conform to it, in all things within the power of it.

The laſt *rubric* at the communion ſervice, againſt adoration, needs not give any trouble herein; ſince it was there added, after the whole *book* had paſſed the *convocation*. And beſides, it is not there ſaid, that no *adoration* is intended, or ought to be done unto any *real* and *eſſential preſence* of Chriſt's natural fleſh and blood (as it was in King *Edward*'s ſecond liturgy, and therefore left out under Queen *Elizabeth*, and onwards till 1662), but it is unto any *corporal preſence*. Which alters the caſe, and may, with thoſe other words, the very *natural ſubſtances*, and the *natural body and blood*, and with the *reaſons* there given thereof, be better conſidered.

## SECT. II.

### *Of the Manner of Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt.*

AS for the manner of Chriſt's preſence in the euchariſt, I find both thoſe of our own church, and the church of *Rome*, agree in terms, that it is ineffable, incomprehenſible, above our reaſon, and a myſtery of faith not to be diſcuſſed by reaſon.

Biſhop *Laud*, *loc. cit.* ſays of *Bellarmin*, If the cardinal had affirmed only Chriſt's real preſence there, after a myſterious and ineffable manner, no man could have ſpoken better.

Biſhop *Forbes*, *de Euch.* l. 3. c. 1. § 10. ſpeaking of Chriſt preſent in the euchariſt, expreſſes it thus: *In ſacra menſa modo ineffabili præſentem:* Preſent on the holy table, in an ineffable manner.

Biſhop *Andrews*, *loc. cit. de modo præſentiæ, nec anxie inquiramus; inter myſteria ducimus; debet fide adorari, non ratione diſcuti.* Of the manner of Chriſt's preſence in the euchariſt, let us not ſolicitouſly enquire.

enquire. We reckon it amongſt myſteries. It is to be adored by faith, not diſcuſſed by reaſon.

I muſt add biſhop *Couſin's Hiſt. Tranſubſt.* p. 36. § 5. n. 4. *Nos vero hunc modum*, &c. We confeſs with the holy fathers, that the manner is ineffable and unſearchable, that is, not to be enquired and ſearched into by reaſon, but to be believed by faith alone. For although it ſeems incredible, that in ſo great a diſtance of place, Chriſt's fleſh ſhould come to us, to become our food; yet we muſt remember, how much the power of the Holy Spirit is above our underſtanding, and how fooliſh it is to meaſure his immenſity by our capacity. But what our underſtanding comprehends not, let faith conceive.

With whom take *Calvin*, *Inſt.* l. 4. c. 17. § 24. *Ego hoc myſterium minime rationis humanæ modo metior, vel naturæ legibus ſubjicio.* § 32. *Porro de modo, ſi quis me interroget, fateri non pudebit, ſublimius eſſe arcanum, quam ut vel meo ingenio comprehendi, vel enarrari verbis queat.* § 25. *Captivas tenemus mentes noſtras, ne verbulo*

*duntaxat obſtrepere audeant.* I do not meaſure this myſtery by human reaſon, nor ſubject it to the laws of nature. For if any aſk of me concerning the *manner*, I will not be aſhamed to confeſs, that it is a myſtery too high for me either to comprehend in thought, or expreſs in words. We captivate our minds, and ſuffer them not to mutter one word.

The *Gallican confeſſion: Hoc myſterium.* This myſtery is ſo high, that it is above all our underſtanding, and the order of nature.

Hear now ſome of the other ſide, and obſerve whether they do not expreſs themſelves almoſt in the ſame terms.

*Lanfranc*, in his anſwer to *Berengarius: Si quæris modum, quo id fieri poſſit: Breviter ad præſens reſpondeo; myſterium eſt fidei: Credi ſalubiter poteſt, veſtigari utiliter non poteſt.* If you enquire after the *manner*, in which this can be done, I anſwer in ſhort: It is a myſtery of faith: it may ſafely be believed, but it cannot ſafely be ſearched into.

Dr. *Holden: Verum & Reale.* We profeſs the true and real body of Chriſt

to

to be in the ſacrament, after an inviſible manner, wholly unknown us. *Fatemur hujuſmodi ſupernaturalis converſionis ſubſtantialis modum nos penitus latere.* We confeſs the manner of this ſupernatural change, is wholly hid from us. *De Reſol. Fid.* l. 2. c. 4.

The council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 13. c. 1. Chriſt's ſubſtance is ſacramentally preſent in many other places, according to another manner of exiſtence; which though we can hardly expreſs in words, yet we can conceive in thought enlightened by faith, that it is not impoſſible to God.

## SECT. III.

### *Something more Particular, as to the Manner.*

I FIND a more particular explication of the *manner* of Chriſt's body being preſent in the euchariſt; and delivered on both ſides alike; it is this: That Chriſt's body is truly and really preſent in the euchariſt; but as to the manner of its being, it is not *corporeal*, or after the

manner of a *body*, but ſpiritual, that is, in the way of a *ſpirit*.

Hear how it is expreſſed by ſome divines of the Romaniſts. *Holden*, p. 316. *Verum, & reale Corpus Chriſti profitemur eſſe in hoc Sacramento: Non more corporeo, & paſſibili, ſed ſpirituali, & inviſibili.* We profeſs the true and real body of Chriſt, to be in the ſacrament; Not in a corporeal and paſſible manner, but ſpiritual and inviſible.

Likewiſe *Veron*, *Rule of Faith*, c. 5. having declared the real preſence of Chriſt in the euchariſt, thus expounds the manner of his exiſtance. We may alſo ſay, that Jeſus Chriſt, according to his manner of being in the ſacrament, is as a *ſpirit*, and that he is there *ſpiritually*, that is, according to the nature of a ſpirit. *John* 6. 63. *The words that I ſpeak unto you are ſpirit and life*, without being ſeen, without extenſion of parts, neither thick nor big as to the occupation of place, for ſpirits in their ſubſtances, are thus truly ſaid to be in places: In fine, that the body of Jeſus Chriſt is here ſpiritual and not ſenſual; ſince St. *Paul* avers the ſame of our bodies, after the reſur-

reſurrection; *it is ſown a natural body, it will riſe a ſpiritual.* 1 Cor. 15. 44. to wit in quality, which ſhall be quite different, and yet the ſubſtance of the body not to periſh. Thus *Veron.*

Now hear the ſame on our ſide delivered by the eminent Biſhop *Taylor* on this Subject §. 1. n. 11. p. 18. It is enquired, (ſays he) whether when we ſay, we believe Chriſt's body to be really in the ſacrament, we mean that body, that fleſh, that was born of the Virgin *Mary*, that was crucified, dead, and buried. I anſwer, I know none elſe, that he had, or hath: there is but one body of Chriſt natural and glorified; but he that ſaith, that body is glorified, which was crucified, ſays, it is the ſame body, but not after the ſame manner; and ſo it is in the ſacrament. We eat, and drink the body and blood of Chriſt, that was broken, and poured forth; for there is no other body, no other blood of Chriſt; but though it is the ſame we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner. And therefore, when any of the Proteſtant divines, or any of the fathers deny, that body, which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, that was crucified,

fied, to be eaten in the ſacrament, as *Bertram*, as St. *Hierom*, as *Clemens Alexandrinus* expreſsly affirm; the meaning is eaſy; they intend, that it is not eaten in a natural ſenſe: And then calling it *Corpus Spirituale*, the word *ſpirituale* is not a ſubſtantial predicate, but is an affirmation of the manner; though in diſputation, it be made the predicate of a propoſition, and the oppoſite member of a diſtinction. That body which was crucified, is not that body that is eaten in the ſacrament, if the intention of the propoſition be to ſpeak of the eating it in the ſame manner of being: But that body which was crucified, the ſame body we do eat, if the intention be to ſpeak of the ſame thing in ſeveral manners of being, and operating; and this I noted, that we may not be prejudiced by words, when the notion is certain and eaſy. And thus far is the ſenſe of our doctrine in this article. Again § 12. p. 288. They that do not confeſs the euchariſt to be the fleſh of our Saviour, which fleſh ſuffered for us, let them be anathema.

Biſhop *Forbes de Euchariſtia*, l. 1. c. 1. § 7. The doctrine of thoſe proteſtants, ſays

ſays he, ſeems moſt ſafe, and true, who are of opinion, nay moſt firmly believe, the body and blood of Chriſt to be truly, and really, and ſubſtantially preſent in the euchariſt, and to be received by the faithful; but that the manner of his being there, is incomprehenſible in reſpect of human reaſon, and ineffable is known to God, and not revealed in the ſcriptures.

But as we have ſeen ſome above explaining the *manner*, in the common way of the *ſchools*; there are others of both ſides, who explain it, upon other principles, by a conſideration of the daily change of the bread we live upon, into our bodies; with this *difference*, that the one is effected by the long way of eating and digeſting it, whereas the other is *ſuddenly* done, by the powerful operation of the Holy Ghoſt, with the words of conſecration. To which they ſeem to have been lead, among others, by St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who to make us more capable of this myſtery, exemplifies in the change of the bread which Chriſt did eat, into his own fleſh; and whom they under-

underſtand to tell us, that as the bread which God gives a bleſſing to, does become our body, inſomuch that one might accordingly, in ſome ſenſe be ſaid to be the other; ſo here this bread is ſanctified, and made the body of Chriſt, not by the uſual proceſs, or way of *manducation*, but by being *immediately* changed into the body of the Word, as ſoon as it is ſaid, This is my body. *Ut enim illic Dei gratia ſanctum efficit illud corpus cujus firmamentum ex pane conſtabat, & ipſum etiam quodammodo panis erat, ſic etiam hic panis per verbum Dei & orationem ſanctificatur; non quia comeditur, eo progrediens ut Verbi corpus evadat, ſed ſtatim per verbum in corpus mutatur, ut dictum eſt a verbo, Hoc eſt corpus meum.* Orat. Cat. 37. S. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, had before declared, that our *ſenſes* are not judges in this caſe. *With all aſſurance* (ſaith he) *receive the body and blood of Chriſt; for under the form of bread, the body is given to thee, and under the form of wine, his blood is given to thee.* And again: *Thou muſt not conſider it as bare bread and wine, for it is the body and blood of Chriſt, according to our Lord's own words;*

*words; for though thy ſenſe make thee think thus, yet faith muſt confirm thee, that thou judge not the thing according to the taſte.* And again: *Know, and be moſt aſſured, that this bread which we ſee, is not bread, though the taſte think it bread, but it is the body of Chriſt; and the wine which we ſee, though to the taſte it ſeems wine, yet it is not wine, but the blood of Chriſt.* Cat. 4. Myſt. But now for the philoſophy of all this, ſee the great *Deſcartes*. Firſt, in his *reſponſio ad quartas objectiones*, where the *ſpecies* are accounted for, by the remaining *ſuperficies*, which only does ſenſibly affect us. Nor need this trouble us, ſince it often happens, that things *appear* otherwiſe than they *are*. Next, in what we find in his *Life*, written in French, *Liv.* 8. *Chap.* 9. where, from his letters to F. *Meſland*, we have this account of the *Change* made in the B. ſacrament: that, *Au lieu ques les particules du pain*, &c. *Whereas the particles of bread and wine ſhould be mingled with the blood of* Jeſus Chriſt, *and there diſpoſed in a particular manner, that his ſoul might particularly inform them, it does here inform them without*

*that*

bo

*that by force of the words of conſecration. And whereas the ſoul of* Jeſus Chriſt *could not continue naturally joined with each of theſe particles of bread and wine, were they not accompanied with many others, which compoſe all the organs of a human body neceſſary to life; it continues joined ſupernaturally to each of them, though they be ſeparated.* The new *diſpoſition* here required for the reception of the ſoul, does argue the change of the elements. But in the ſame chapter, we may alſo ſee, how this explication has been approved by ſeveral great men at *Paris*, *Louvain*, and elſewhere; which is here mentioned to ſhew the liberty they take about the *Modus*, while they do all at the ſame time, agree in the *thing*.

## SECT. IV.

### *Of Tranſubſtantiation.*

HITHERTO we have proceeded with conſent, about the explication of the manner thereof. But the great point is ſtill to be examined. And here Firſt, it is to be conſidered, whether *Tranſubſtantiation* be the *mode*, or the *thing* itſelf, and

and what ſtreſs is to be laid upon the *word*. For which let us conſult Dr. *Parker*, late biſhop of *Oxford*, in his *reaſons for abrogating the teſt:* I know (ſaith he) it is commonly ſaid, that the council of *Trent* hath preſumed to define the *modus*; and learned men (I know not by what fatal overſight) take it upon truſt one from another; and the definition is generally given in theſe terms: That tranſubſtantiation is wrought by the *annihilation* of the *ſubſtance* of the bread and wine, the *accidents* remaining: To the which annihilation ſucceeds the body and blood of Chriſt, under the accidents of bread and wine. So the biſhops of *Durham* and *Wincheſter* repreſent it; ſo Mr. *Alix*, and the writers of his church. But I cannot but wonder how ſo many learned men ſhould with ſo much aſſurance fancy to themſelves ſuch a definition in the *Trent* Council, of the *Modus* of tranſubſtantiation, by the *annihilation* of the *ſubſtance*, and the *permanency* of the *accidents*, when the fathers of that council were ſo far from any ſuch deſign, that they

they deſigned nothing more carefully, than to avoid all ſcholaſtic definitions. *P.* 23. 24. And a little after: This is the *definition* of the council of *Trent*, of the *real preſence*, that there is a *converſion* of the *ſubſtances* under the ſpecies and appearances of bread and wine, which the church hath thought convenient to expreſs by the word tranſubſtantiation. And yet though the council approve the word, yet it does not impoſe it, it only declares it to be *convenient*, [*fit* and *proper*] but no where ſays it is *neceſſary*. *Page* 27. And again: Though perhaps all the fathers of the council believed the reality of the new ſubſtantial preſence under the old accidents, yet they had more temper and diſcretion than to authoriſe it by conciliar determination, and therefore uſe only the word *ſpecies* (and no other word is uſed by *Nicholas* II. *Gregory* VII. and *Innocent* III. that are thought the three great innovators in the argument of the *real preſence*) that properly ſignifies appearance, but nothing of phyſical or natural reality, ſo that though the

the preſence under the ſpecies be *real*, yet as the council hath defined it, it is not *natural* but *ſacramental*, which *ſacramental real preſence* they expreſs by the word *tranſubſtantiation*, and recommend the propriety of the word to the acceptance of chriſtendom. *Page* 27, 28.

Next then, I ſhall take the *thing* itſelf, as I find it delivered by the church of *Rome*, and then ſhall ſee, how near we can come to it.

By the thing underſtood by tranſubſtantiation is meant in the church of *Rome*, a *change* of the ſubſtances of the bread and wine, into the ſubſtance of the body and blood of Chriſt. And this as the council of *Trent* ſays, has been always the doctrine of that church, though firſt ſolemnly declared in the council of *Lateran*. Seſſ. 13. c. 4.

They confeſs, that the *word* is not any where in ſcripture. But they ſay, the *ſenſe* and full meaning of it, by neceſſary conſequence at leaſt, is delivered in the goſpel, and therefore certainly and neceſſarily true. And thus they explain them:

themſelves: Chriſt ſaid it was his body, which he gave under the ſpecies of bread. If it was really, and indeed his body, then ſay they, it cannot be bread: Becauſe that which is bread, cannot be really, and indeed the true and real body of Chriſt. Therefore that which was really bread, is not now bread, after the conſecration, but is by the divine power, (which can change one thing into another) become the true body of Chriſt. And this is what is called a converſion, or change: And being not made in the outward accidents or appearance (which are ſtill the ſame) but only in the ſubſtance, which is inviſible, therefore they have framed a new word to expreſs it, *viz.* tranſubſtantiation. They clear this by an example.

As at the marriage-feaſt of *Cana*, that, which was truly water, is by the power of Chriſt, made true and real wine: And it being now abſolutely true, that *This is wine*, it is no longer true, *This is water*; but that which was truly water, is now *not water*, but *wine*. So they underſtand

derſtand in this myſtery, as to the ſubſtance: That, which *was truly bread*, is now *truly and really the body of our Lord*. Therefore if it be owned abſolutely true, after conſecration (as has been already ſhewn) that, *This is my body*, it is not now *truly bread*; but that, which was bread, is now made to be *truly and really the body of Chriſt*. As therefore, at *Cana*, he *made the water wine*, as it is ſaid, *John* 4. 46. ſo at his laſt ſupper, he made bread his body. So that, according to their ſentiments, they believe nothing more, than what the expreſs words of Chriſt oblige them to. And this the great *Lateran* council declared when this queſtion was firſt debated, ſix hundred years ago, and aſſerted, that in this ſenſe it had been delivered to them from the primitive church; and accordingly quote many teſtimonies of the antient fathers, ſeeming to concur in this very doctrine: Thus they.

Now as to our ſide of the church of *England*. I find ſome in the firſt place, owning the poſſibility of tranſubſtantiation.

tion. As biſhop *Forbes*, who thus delivers himſelf upon this ſubject. *De Euchariſtia*, l. 1. c. 2. Many proteſtants, (ſays he) too boldly and dangerouſly deny that God has power to tranſubſtantiate the bread into the body of Chriſt. It is true, all own, that what implies a contradiction, cannot be done. But becauſe, in particular, no body certainly knows what is the eſſence of every thing, and conſequently what implies a contradiction, and what not; it is without queſtion, a raſhneſs in any, to put limits to God's power. I approve the opinion of the divines of *Wittemberg*, who aſſert the power of God to be ſo great, that he can change the ſubſtance of the bread and wine, into the body and blood of Chriſt.

Mr. *Thorndike* owns a change in fact. *Epil.* l. 3. c. 5. where he ſays, The elements are really changed from ordinary bread and wine, into the body and blood of Chriſt, myſtically preſent, as in a ſacrament; and that in virtue of the conſecration, not by the faith of him that receives.

Biſhop

Biſhop *Montague*, *Appeal.* c. 31. aſſerts in the contents, that the conſecration of the elements cauſeth a change. And in the body of the chapter, cites ſeveral of the primitive fathers, owning the ſame: As St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *Catech.* 5. *Precamur Deum hominum amantem, ut emittat ſanctum ſuum ſpiritum in res propoſitas, ut faciat panem Corpus Chriſti, & vinum Sanguinem Chriſti.* For, *Quicquid contigerit Spiritus Sanctus, illud ipſum* ἡγιάϛαι και μεταβέβληται, ſays St. *Baſil* in his *liturgy*. We beſeech God, the lover of men, to ſend forth his holy ſpirit upon the things propoſed, that he would make the bread the body of Chriſt, and the wine the blood of Chriſt. For whatever the Holy Ghoſt touches, that thing is ſanctified and changed. St. *Cyprian*, *Iſte panis, quem diſcipulis ſuis porrigebat, non effigie, ſed natura mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus eſt caro. Et ſicut in perſona Chriſti, humanitas videbatur, latebat divinitas; ita ſacramento viſibili, inviſibiliter divina ſe infundit ſubſtantia.* That bread which our Lord gave to his diſciples, not changed in outward form, but in nature, by the almighty power of the Word

Word, was made fleſh. And as in the perſon of Chriſt, his humanity was ſeen, and his divinity was hid; ſo in the viſible ſacrament, the divine ſubſtance inviſibly infuſes itſelf. St. *Ambroſe:* Before conſecration it was bread, common bread, but after conſecration, it becometh the fleſh of Chriſt, becauſe then the ſacrament is conſummate. And the ſame father; *Forte dices, meus panis eſt uſitatus; ſed panis iſte, ante verba ſacramentorum, panis eſt; ubi acceſſerit conſecratio de pane fit Caro Chriſti.* Perhaps you will ſay, my bread is common bread; but this bread before the ſacramental words, is bread, but when it is conſecrated, of bread it is made the fleſh of Chriſt.

Then he remarks how this change is termed by the antient fathers. St. *Cyril* aſſerting in this myſtery μεταβολὴ. *Theophilact*, μεταποίησις. *Gregory Nyſſen*, μετασχηματισμὸς. St. *Chryſoſtom*, μετασοιχειωσις; and the biſhop after this, calling it a *tranſmutation*, and *tranſelementation*. But however, though this prelate goes ſo far in confeſſing a change upon conſecration, and that it has been ſo believed by the primitive church,

church, yet he is not for *tranſubſtantiation*, but poſitively declares againſt it.

The biſhop of *Oxford* before mentioned, ſhould here alſo be heard, in what he ſays to this point, in his *reaſons* againſt the *teſt*: It is evident (ſaith he) to all men that are but ordinarily converſant in eccleſiaſtical learning, that the antient fathers, from age to age, aſſerted the *real* and *ſubſtantial* preſence, in very high and expreſſive terms. The *Greeks* ſtiled it, Μεταβολὴ, μεταῤῥύθμισις, μεταςκευασμὸς, μεταποίησις, μετασχηματισμὸς. And the *Latins* agreeable with the *Greeks*, *converſion*, *tranſmutation*, *transformation*, *transfiguration*, *tranſelementation*, and at length, *tranſubſtantiation*: By all which, they expreſſed nothing more nor leſs, than the *real* and *ſubſtantial* preſence in the euchariſt, *pag.* 13. And afterwards: In the *Greek* form (ſaith he) of conſecration, this prayer was uſed: *Make this bread the precious body of thy Chriſt; and that which is in this cup, the precious blood of thy Chriſt*; changing *them by thy Holy Spirit*: Which words are taken out of the liturgies of St. *Chryſoſtom* and St. *Baſil*. And *Jeremias*, the learned *Patriarch of Conſtantinople*, in his declara-

tion of the faith of the *Greek* church, in anſwer to the *Lutheran* divines, affirms, *That the catholic church believes, that after the conſecration, the bread is* changed *into the very body of Chriſt, and the wine into the very blood, by the Holy Spirit*, p. 33. And having both before and after this, given the judgment of foreign churches, he concludes thus: This is the account of this controverſy, in all foreign churches. All parties of Chriſtendom, agree in the *ſubſtance* of the *doctrine*, even the *Calviniſts* themſelves; who, though they ſometimes attempted to deny it, had not confidence enough to be ſteady to their own opinion, but were often forced to ſubmit it to the conſent of Chriſtendom, *p.* 46. And a little after: As for the church (ſaith he) of *England*, ſhe agrees with the tradition of the *catholic* church, in aſſerting the *certainty* of the *real preſence*, and the *uncertainty* of the *manner* of it: Though the true account of it hath been miſerably perplexed, and diſturbed by the oblique practices of the Sacramentarians, *p.* 47.

I have been large in the citations from my authors, to ſhew, how far has been taught

taught and believed in our church, and how far may ſtill be believed in her communion. And to ſum up, now in a few words, what conceſſions have been made within her pale, they are theſe, *viz.* That Chriſt is not only figuratively in the ſacrament, but his body is truly and really preſent; the ſame body which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and crucified: That the manner of his being in the ſacrament, is wonderful, and almoſt wholly ineffable; not to be fully comprehended by human reaſon: That Chriſt is ſo preſent in the euchariſt, that he may, and ought to be there adored. That this his preſence, is effected by a change, or converſion wrought by an almighty power, in virtue of the words of conſecration.

So far has been taught by our own prelates, and may ſtill be believed within our communion; and the very ſame is taught by the church of *Rome*: So that none will be queſtioned in that church, of not being orthodox, as to this point, who makes this profeſſion.

And why then may there not be hopes of accommodation in this grand point,

when that, which is a ſufficient profeſſion to be admitted into one communion, is taught and allowed in the other? Private perſons and even paſtors, who thus believe and teach, are not caſt out of our communion on this account: And why then ſhould we ſeparate communion from a church upon the ſame?

It is true, that tranſubſtantiation has occaſioned great heats; but may there not be here ſome hopes of peace? It is pity a piece of logic ſhould divide churches, and diſturb the world. For my part, upon a ſerious peruſal of the council of *Trent*, and their beſt divines, I can diſcover nothing more in it. Divines on both ſides eminent, agree, *Hoc eſt corpus meum: This is my body:* allowing the real preſence of Chriſt's true body, for verifying the propoſition. We agree about the *Hoc eſt*, ſays biſhop *Andrews:* This is the ſubſtantial point; in this then is an agreement about the preſence of Chriſt. Now the *Romaniſts* go on, and ſay, that for verifying the propoſition, *Hoc eſt, Corpus meum*, we muſt believe farther: For the propoſition (ſay they) aſſerting, *This is my body*, cannot be

be true, in the ſenſe as now agreed on, except it be his body; and if it be *his body*, then *it is not bread*; but that, which was bread is made his body; and this is all their tranſubſtantiation. Now what is this but a piece of logic, even a diſpute of what is required to the verifying a propoſition? It is true, beſides the logic, they ſay, it is a truth they have ſo received from the primitive church, and therefore upon this head, are bound not to depart from it; but as to us, thoſe amongſt us, who confeſs a real preſence of Chriſt in the ſacrament, and confeſs it ſo, as to declare, there is no difference between the two churches in this point, theſe I ſay, ſeem to offer fair for compounding all the reſt. For whilſt they in this own the ſubject of this myſtery to be above the laws of nature, to be above the reach of reaſon, that it is wrought by the power of the Holy Ghoſt, that it is the effect of an Almighty Power, and aſſert this from antiquity, do not they here ſurrender the whole cauſe out of the hands of reaſon, and ſubmit entirely to faith, and having

advanced ſo far, what can be the objections, after this, from natural philoſophy, or logic, in a point already confeſſed to be above their enquiry?

Thus from theſe conceſſions of our own learned prelates, I raiſe hopes of peace, and am confirmed in my hopes by the learned *Grotius*; who, having duly weighed this whole matter, ſays, Firſt, it is the explications of ſchoolmen create the offence that is taken againſt the word *tranſubſtantiation*, which explications, we may lay by. Secondly, he joins with our prelates as to the chief point, declaring in theſe words: *The fathers, and very many proteſtants do affirm it for certain, that together with the ſigns, the thing itſelf is exhibited; but in a manner that is not perceptible by the external ſenſes.* And then laſtly makes this concluſion, upon the whole queſtion in debate: *To ſpeak my heart*, ſays he, *I think that many diſputers do underſtand well enough the ſenſe of the antient church, and of the preſent Greek and Latin: but they diſſemble it, that they may have matter to declaim upon, among thoſe that make more uſe*

*of*

*of their outward ſenſes than their inward.* Here is *Grotius*'s judgment in this great point as ſet down in a ſmall collection in Engliſh, tranſlated out of his *Vote*, for peace, p. 92. *Of tranſubſtantiation.* And while he, upon ſo ſtrict a ſearch, and ſuch mature deliberation thus pronounces, may it not be hoped, that the love of peace and compaſſion to divided Chriſtendom will influence ſo ſtrongly ſome pious breaſts, as not to let ſchool opinions, and the love of wrangling, keep up thoſe heats, which inflame the world, and conſume religion under the notion of refining it?

## SECT. V.

### *Of the Maſs.*

BY this word *Maſs*, which was uſed by St. *Ambroſe*, and alſo in the firſt liturgy of King *Edward* VI. I find the Romaniſts mean no more, than the performing, as to this point, that which Chriſt did at his laſt ſupper, when he gave his apoſtles, and by them to their

ſucceſſors, power of conſecrating the bread and wine, into the body and blood of Chriſt, and commanded them to do what he had there done, in remembrance of his death and paſſion on the croſs. Now while Chriſt is here offered in teſtimony of God, being the Sovereign Lord of life and death, they call this offering a *ſacrifice:* And Chriſt being here offered under the forms of bread and wine, therefore they term it an *unbloody ſacrifice:* And this being done in remembrance of Chriſt being offered for our ſins, a ſacrifice on the croſs, hence they call it *a commemorative ſacrifice:* And while the virtue of Chriſt's paſſion, is applied to Chriſtians by means of this offering, as it is likewiſe by acts of faith, of prayer, and contrition; which are therefore truly *propitiatory*; hence they declare this offering to be *propitiatory.* This is the explication given by them, conformable to what is delivered upon this point in the council of *Trent. Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 1.

The ſubſtance of this doctrine, I find delivered by Mr. *Thorndike, Epil. l.* 3. *c.* 5.

*c.* 5. p. 44, where having maintained, that the elements are really changed from ordinary bread and wine, into the body and blood of Chriſt, myſtically preſent, as in a ſacrament, and that in virtue of the conſecration, not by the faith of him that receives. He then adds thus: I am to admit, and maintain whatſoever appears duly conſequent to this truth: namely, that the elements ſo conſecrated, are truly the ſacrifice of Chriſt upon the croſs, in as much as the body and blood of Chriſt are contained in them. Then, *p.* 46, he farther collects thus: And the ſacrifice of the croſs, being neceſſarily propitiatory, and impetratory both, it cannot be denied that the ſacrament of the euchariſt, in as much as it is the ſame ſacrifice upon the croſs, is alſo both propitiatory, and impetratory.

Biſhop *Forbes* comes up to the ſame. *De Euch. l.* 3. *c.* 1. §. 10. *Dicunt etiam ſæpiſſime ſancti patres in euchariſtia offerri, & ſacrificari ipſum Chriſti Corpus, ut ex innumeris pene locis conſtat.* The holy fathers very frequently ſay, that in the euchariſt is offered and ſacrificed, the

very body of Chriſt, as is evident in infinite places: Not that all the conditions of a ſacrifice, are here properly and really found; but by a commemoration, and repreſentation of that, which was once offered in that only ſacrifice of the croſs, in which Chriſt our high prieſt, conſummated all other ſacrifices; and by a pious ſupplication, in which the miniſters of the church, with all humility, beſeech God the Father, that for the ſake of the perpetual victim of that only ſacrifice, ſitting at the right hand of his father in Heaven, and preſent upon the holy table, in an ineffable manner, he would cauſe the virtue and grace of this ſtanding victim, to be efficacious, and advantageous to his church, for the remedy of all neceſſities, both of body and ſoul.

The ſame prelate aſſerts yet plainer, *De Euch. l.* 3. *c.* 2. §. 12. This ſacrifice of the ſupper, is not only propitiatory, and may be offered up for the remiſſion of our daily ſins; but likewiſe is impetratory, and may be rightly offered for the obtaining all bleſſings. And then adds,

adds, Although the ſcripture does not plainly and in expreſs words, teach this, yet the holy fathers with unanimous conſent, have thus underſtood the ſcriptures, as has at large been demonſtrated by many: And all the antient liturgies preſcribe, that in time of the oblation, prayers be offered for peace, for the fruits of the earth, and for other temporal benefits, as it is evident to all.

In this point I ſee but little difference, but that which is taught in the church of *Rome*, is taught and contended for, within the pale of the church of *England*; and this by men of learning and note. But for making it ſtill more plain, hear what is the judgment of *Grotius*. The church, ſays he, commemorating the ſacrifice of Chriſt, with the uſual rite and words, in this alſo, ſacrificeth, and offers that which is her own, given unto her by Chriſt: That ſhe ſetteth before the eyes of God; by that ſhe beſeecheth God: And it is the ſame ſacrifice that Chriſt offered; the ſame one, true and ſingular ſacrifice to *Auguſtin*; a

ſacrifice

ſacrifice of memory to *Euſebius*; a ſpiritual ſacrifice to others. After that, the faithful offer themſelves, according to the example of Chriſt, their goods, their labours, their life alſo; if not in effect, in affection, as *Abraham* ſacrificing, offered his ſon. In all this, what is there new? what deformed? what hurtful? But minds once diſtracted, do diſtract all things into a depraved meaning, and then are glad to find a hint for it, in any of the ſchools. *Ubi Supr. Of Chriſtian ſacrifices.*

---

## CHAP. VI.

### *Of Communion in one Kind.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER the church of *Rome* does not act contrary to the command of Chriſt, in forbidding the people the uſe of the cup?

It is one of our rules, never to charge upon men the conſequences of their opinions, when they expreſsly diſown them. This ſeems to be our preſent caſe. For though

though it be true, that in the church of *Rome*, is denied the cup to the people, yet they deny this to be contrary to Chriſt's command. And could it be made evident to them, that this is contrary to the command of Chriſt, I have reaſon to believe, they would abhor the practice. My reaſon is, becauſe upon full examination into their principles, profeſſion, books of devotion, and inſtruction, I find they believe in Chriſt in the ſame manner as is taught by us in the church of *England*; they profeſs him to be the ſupreme law-giver, that he is the way, the truth, and the life; that his goſpel is ſuch a rule of ſalvation, that whoever lives in the known tranſgreſſion of it, can have no part in Chriſt. This I aſſert upon my own knowledge; and therefore as to the charge in this point, of their acting contrary to the command of Chriſt, it is a conſequence, which they utterly deny, and hence falling under the rule now mentioned, ought not to be preſſed.

*Queſt.* II. Whether it be not evident, that Chriſt gave expreſs command to all

to

to drink of the cup, in thoſe words, *Drink ye all of this:* and therefore the practice of denying the cup, utterly to be abhorred?

This being a charge againſt the Romaniſts, it is but juſt they ſhould ſpeak for themſelves; therefore I here ſet down the defence they make.

They with us own theſe words ſpoke by Chriſt, *Drink ye all of this*; they own them likewiſe to be a plain command; but to thoſe to whom Chriſt ſpoke them, that is, to the apoſtles (and to their ſucceſſors) whom he then made prieſts, and gave them power to conſecrate the elements, as he had done; for that as the power of conſecrating, which Chriſt then gave to the apoſtles, is not to be extended to the laity, ſo neither the command of *drinking*, which he gave at the ſame time. This they explain by ſeveral other commands of Chriſt, given to the apoſtles; as *Go and teach all nations, receive ye the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins ye forgive, they are forgiven*, &c. With others of this kind, in which it is plain, what

Chriſt

Chriſt ſpoke to his apoſtles, and to their ſucceſſors, is not all intended, or directed to the people. Thus they confeſs the evidence of the command, but ſay, there is no evidence from ſcripture, that this was a command given by Chriſt to the laity.

*Queſt.* III. Whether the practice of the primitive church, in giving the ſacrament, in both kinds, be not evidence, that Chriſt's words were underſtood, as a command to the laity?

The *Romaniſts* agree with us, and own that it was the moſt general practice of the primitive church, for all to receive in both kinds, even for eleven hundred years; but then they ſay, that the church did not do this, as judging it neceſſary to be ſo done, in obedience to any command of Chriſt, who had enjoined it to be given in both kinds. And this they prove from matter of fact, it being evident in the records of antiquity, that in the pureſt ages, it was the practice in many caſes, to give the communion in one kind only; as, to the ſolitaries, to whom it was carried into the deſert, to the

the ſick, to perſons on a journey, to infants, to the abſtemious. And for ſome time alſo, in ſome places, in the ordinary communion at church; as appears from St. *Leo* the Great, and St. *Gelaſius*, who was his ſucceſſor in the *Roman* ſee, being likewiſe taken notice of by *Caſſander* and *Grotius*. Now this being practiſed by the antient church, it is moſt evident, ſay they, it was judged then to be good and lawful to receive in one kind; which yet they could not judge, if it had been their ſentiment, that Chriſt had left a command for all to receive in both; for in this ſuppoſition, it muſt have been abhorred, as a thing contrary to a plain precept of Chriſt.

Hence again, the *Romaniſts* argue from this allowed practice; that as the primitive church judged it good and lawful to receive in both kinds, ſo they likewiſe judged it good and lawful (upon ſome motives and circumſtances) to receive in one kind; and conſequently, that the manner of receiving, whether in both kinds, or one, was no matter of precept, but ſubject to difference of practice, according

cording to circumſtances, and therefore reputed as a point of diſcipline, capable of change. And this is the very ſentiment of the *Roman* church: For they ſay, it is good to receive in one kind; and likewiſe, that it is good to receive in both. It was the general practice formerly, to receive in both kinds, and ſo it may be again. This was the ſenſe of the church, even before the reſtraint was laid by the council of *Conſtance*; it being evident from hiſtory, that ſeveral biſhops, obſerving the irreverences committed in giving the cup, forbid it to be given to the laity in their dioceſſes, even before the meeting of that council, as it was likewiſe done by the *Ciſtercian* order; which plainly ſhews, that the receiving in both kinds, or one, was judged no matter of precept, but only of diſcipline, determinable by circumſtances. In which ſentiment, it may be preſumed, the *Greek* church did concur, who laying hold on all arguments to juſtify their not communicating with the Latin church, never mentioned this of forbidding the cup to the laity,

laity, which they would certainly have done, had they judged the receiving in both kinds to have been of precept.

So far at leaſt the preſent Greek church concurs with the Latin, as not to take thoſe words of Chriſt, *Drink ye all of this*, to be a precept in the literal ſenſe: whilſt it no where gives the cup to the laity to drink: but communicates the people with the ſymbol of Chriſt's body intinct in that of his blood, taken out of the chalice with a little ſpoon, and ſo put into their mouths; which is not literally drinking of the cup. And the ſick they communicate only with the ſymbol of Chriſt's body conſecrated on *Maundy Thurſday*, for all the year following, and then on that day, beſprinkled with the ſymbol of his blood, and at the ſame time dried and hardened over the fire, and ſoftened again for the ſick, with common wine, at the time, when they adminiſter it. The former way then of communicating the people generally in both kinds, has been changed in both churches, and upon the ſame grounds, namely, upon the many, and great irreverences, that have happened,

happened, in giving the conſecrated bread into their hands, and in allowing ſo many communicants of all ages and conditions to drink out of the cup. And while changed in fact in the preſent Greek and Latin churches, and differently adminiſtered in the primitive church, that is never giving it in both kinds, when there was danger of irreverence by adminiſtering it in both; hence they argue, that the *manner* of adminiſtering the ſacrament, is only of diſcipline, and alterable; and that the ſenſe of the primitive church was the ſame as now it is in the Greek and Latin; *viz.* that wherever there is danger of irreverence in giving the ſacrament in both kinds, there is no precept, for ſo giving it, but it may be lawfully and profitably given in one.

Theſe are ſome of the reaſons, upon which the Church of *Rome* proceeds, and endeavours to prove, that the giving the cup to all is not of precept, and conſequently, that ſhe tranſgreſſes no precept in forbidding it, upon due motives to the laity. Now upon examination, I find ſeveral leading men of the refor-

reformation, and even ſome of note in our own church, agreeing with the Romaniſts, and owning, that Chriſt has no where in ſcripture given command for all to receive in both kinds. As biſhop *Forbes*, who owns the primitive practice of giving the communion in one kind, in particular caſes, and biſhop *White*, and biſhop *Montague*, who ſay, the authority for giving it in both kinds, is rather from tradition than ſcripture. So far do theſe *learned* men grant, and in this contribute to the accommodating this conſiderable point. For if it can be allowed in our church, that there is no precept in ſcripture for giving the ſacrament in both kinds, then in our church we may confeſs, that it is not contrary to any precept, to forbid the cup to the laity; and conſequently according to our ſixth rule, this ought not to be made the breach of communion, ſince it is not a practice againſt the laws of God. But if we cannot do this, yet ſtill peace ought not to be deſpaired on this account, ſince the church of *Rome*, owning this to be a point of diſcipline only, and therefore alterable, can yield to us in this

this point; as it did to the Emperor *Ferdinand*, *an.* 1564, in granting the uſe of the cup to the laity in the German nation, upon the hopes of gaining that people, by ſuch condeſcenſion, to the unity of the church, it having been left by the council of *Conſtance*, to the Pope's prudence, to grant leave to any nation, or people, of communicating in both kinds, as he ſhould judge reaſonable. What therefore has been already done, upon the deſire of peace, may be done again, upon the ſame motive, as it was indeed offered by the Pope to Queen *Elizabeth*.

*Queſt.* IV. Whether the decree of *Conſtance* was with a *non obſtante* to Chriſt's command?

This could not be in their ſyſtem, ſince they poſitively aſſert, that there was no ſuch command of Chriſt. It was *non obſtante inſtitutione*. That although Chriſt ordained it in both kinds, in regard to the apoſtles, and the exerciſe of prieſtly function, yet ſtill the cup might, upon due motives, be denied to the laity; which alters the caſe, and anſwers the queſtion,

queſtion, ſo as not to be made an exception againſt catholic communion.

*Queſt.* V. Whether the denial of the cup be not defrauding the laity?

This ſeems a conſequence, according to our common opinion of the ſacrament; but in the ſenſe of the church of *Rome*, it ſeems not juſt to charge it upon them. For while they firmly believe and teach, (and ſome of ours hold with them) that not only the virtue and benefits of Chriſt's paſſion is applied by the ſacrament; but likewiſe, that Chriſt is really given to the communicant; it is certain, according to this doctrine that no more is received in both kinds, than in one; it is Chriſt is given in one kind, and no more than Chriſt in both; and who can ſay, that having Chriſt communicated unto them, they are defrauded of any thing, while in Chriſt they have and poſſeſs all? Beſides, that no prieſt, biſhop, or pope, receives otherwiſe than the laity, in one kind only, unleſs they conſecrate, and then it is for the ſacrifice, that both kinds are neceſſary, not for the communion. So that here none can ſuſpect any fraud. As

to

to the thing received, it is the very ſame received both by laity and clergy; all the difference is in the *manner* of receiving: And while this *manner* has been various in all times, according to circumſtances, without the leaſt ſuſpicion of any defrauding, it ſeems not reaſonable to preſs this charge now, eſpecially ſince, according to our fourth rule, the conſequences of men's opinions ought not to be charged upon them, ſuch conſequences at leaſt as they deny, and apprehend no reaſon to ſuſpect.

Thus there may be hopes of compounding this point; whilſt, if we cannot come over to them, they may yield here and come to us.

---

## CHAP. VII.

### *Of praying for the Dead, and Purgatory.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER the preaching up purgatory does not make perſons bold in ſin, and neglect repentance?

If it does, it is a great abuſe, which that church does not approve, much leſs impoſe on any, and therefore ought not accord-

according to our ſecond rule, be preſſed as an occaſion of diſtinct communion. By what I obſerve in their ſpiritual books, they preſs the neceſſity of true repentance, as much as we can deſire. But if libertines amongſt them, obſerve not ſuch directions, this cannot in juſtice be caſt upon purgatory; ſince it is evident they live in defiance of hell, and through want of faith, or blindneſs, put all to the hazard; and are theſe no where to be found, but where purgatory is taught?

*Queſt.* II. Whether their praying for the moſt wicked ſinners, be not a proof, that they think purgatory a ſhelter for all crimes?

They poſitively believe, as we do, that as the very good and faithful ſervants of God go directly to heaven, ſo ſinners, who die without a ſincere repentance, go directly to hell. In this we agree. But becauſe the inward ſtate of a dying chriſtian is unknown to them, therefore ſuſpending all judging in a caſe, wherein not they, but God alone is judge, they let charity prevail, which ſuppoſing, and hoping the beſt, prays for

for all ſuch as die; knowing, that if the ſouls for which they pray are not capable of relief, yet their prayers will not be loſt before God, who is the faithful rewarder of charity, even though it happens to be miſapplied. Juſt as the apoſtolical ſalutation, *Peace be to this houſe*, was not loſt, even in a houſe where there was no ſon of peace; for that in this caſe, Chriſt promiſed, the peace ſhould return to their benefit, who made the prayer of peace for their neighbour. Thus they expound their charity, and it being an innocent piety, if not well grounded, it need be no occaſion of breach between us.

*Queſt.* III. Whether the doctrine of purgatory be not a point of meer gain, and many ridiculous deliverances from that priſon pretended, for making the people liberal in opening their purſes, for their intereſt, who ſerve the altar?

I cannot but fear great abuſes in a caſe, where money is ſtirring; for ſo it was, even in the pureſt times of the apoſtles. But whatever theſe abuſes are, upon examination, I find, that church approves not of ſuch abuſes, but in the

council of *Trent*, takes notice of them, and ſtrictly gives it in charge to the biſhops, to take care for their being reformed. *Seſſ.* 25. *Decr. de Purg.* There they are firſt enjoined, that nothing be taught of purgatory, but according to what is delivered by the holy fathers, and ſacred councils. Secondly, that they ſuffer nothing to be publiſhed or preached, which can be ſuſpected of being falſe or uncertain. Thirdly, that they forbid, and take away all that ſavours of ſuperſtition or filthy lucre, as being ſcandals and ſtumbling-blocks to the faithful. Now, while that church is ſo far from impoſing ſuch abuſes and ill practices, that ſhe joins with us in deſiring and requiring their reformation, this queſtion, according to our ſecond rule, may be laid by, and be made no hinderance to communion; ſince the communion here propoſed, is not with the corruptions of church-men, but with the church, which declares againſt ſuch corruptions, though not wholly removed, for want of due execution of her injunctions.

*Queſt.* IV. Whether praying for the ſouls of ſuch as are dead, be not vain, and ſuperſtitious; and being no where found

found in ſcripture, is a practice, which cannot be joined with or approved?

The church of *Rome* confeſſes this practice to be no where taught in ſcripture, more plainly than in the apocryphal books; as 2 *Macch.* 12. 43. But then ſhe ſays, this doctrine and practice, has been delivered down in all ages, even the moſt primitive; not only in the writings of the fathers, but by the agreeing practice of the univerſal church; that it cannot be queſtioned to have been ordained by the apoſtles, and received from them, by all chriſtian churches, wherever the goſpel was preached by them.

I have examined this point, and muſt confeſs, I have found very great authority for it, both in conſent of fathers, and antient practice. But having undertaken only to relate, I inſert not my own thoughts, but the judgment of others: And for this point, hear firſt what the late Ducheſs of *York* ſays in her paper. "I ſpoke ſeverally to two of the beſt biſhops we have in *England* [*Sheldon*, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and *Blandford*, biſhop of *Worceſter*.] Who both told me, there were many things in the *Roman*

church, which it were very much to be wiſhed, we had kept: As confeſſion, which was, no doubt, commanded by God: That praying for the dead, was one of the antient things in Chriſtianity: That for their parts, they did it daily, though they would not own it." But next, it may be of good uſe alſo, to ſet down here the epitaphs, which biſhop *Barrow*, of St. *Aſaph*, and Mr. *Thorndike*, a prebendary of *Weſtminſter*, left for themſelves. The firſt is: *Exuviæ Iſaaci Aſaphenſis epiſcopi, in manum Domini depoſitæ, in ſpem lætæ reſurrectionis per ſola Chriſti merita. O vos tranſeuntes in domum Domini, domum orationis, orate pro conſervo veſtro, ut inveniat miſericordiam in die Domini.* The other is: *Hic jacet corpus Herberti Thorndike, quondam hujus eccleſiæ præbendarij, qui vivus veram reformandæ eccleſiæ rationem & modum, precibus ſtudiiſque proſequebatur. Tu lector requiem ei & beatam in Chriſto reſurrectionem precare.* And before theſe was that other eminent prelate, I mean biſhop *Forbes*, who was very free to tell us his thoughts, in his *Diſcourſe* of *Purgatory*.

Let

Let not the antient practice, *ſays he*, of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the univerſal church of Chriſt, almoſt from the very time of the apoſtles, be any more rejected by Proteſtants as unlawful, or vain. Let them reverence the judgment of the primitive church, and admit a practice ſtrengthened by the uninterrupted profeſſion of ſo many ages: And let them as well in public as private, obſerve this rite, although not as abſolutely neceſſary, or commanded by the divine law, yet as lawful, and likewiſe profitable, and as always approved by the univerſal church; that by this means, at length, a peace ſo earneſtly deſired by all learned and honeſt men, may be reſtored to the Chriſtian world.

Again: The univerſal church, *ſays he*, has believed this practice, not only to be lawful, but likewiſe beneficial to the ſouls departed: And has always moſt religiouſly obſerved it, as delivered, if not from the apoſtles, at leaſt from the primitive fathers; as is manifeſt in many places of their writings. Let it be granted, that this cuſtom was always

judged lawful, and alſo profitable by pious antiquity, and moſt univerſally received at all times in the church. And then he declares, that it is evident in *Epiphanius*, and St. *Auguſtin*, that the contrary opinion of *Aerius*, who oppoſed prayers and oblations for the dead, was condemned.

Again: He confeſſes, that very many of the primitive fathers were of opinion, that ſome light offences, not remitted in this life, as to their guilt and puniſhment, were forgiven after death, by the interceſſion of the church in her public prayers, and eſpecially thoſe, which were offered up in the celebration of the tremendous myſteries; as likewiſe by the prayers, oblations or alms, given for them by private perſons. Many councils concur with theſe fathers, and the moſt antient practice of the church, not to be ſlighted, or raſhly rejected by any, unleſs it evidently be againſt the ſcripture; which in this matter, will be very hard to be proved. And again: It is no abſurdity, *ſays he*, to own, that lighter ſins, ſuch as were not remitted in this life, are diſcharged after death, and that

ſoon

ſoon after the deceaſe; while the eccleſiaſtical rites are piouſly and religiouſly performed, in virtue of the interceſſion of the church, in her public prayers, and particularly thoſe which are poured forth in the celebration of the ſacred liturgy. Again: Theſe things, which I have ſaid of the remiſſion of venal ſin after death, through the mediation of the church, may be allowed, as not wanting its probable grounds; that ſo we may maintain the prayers of the church for the ſouls departed, to be beneficial, and not in vain; in as much as that practice of the church, of praying for the dead is derived, as *Chryſoſtom* confeſſes, and is very probable, from the inſtitution of the apoſtles.

Thus is it aſſerted, and ſo great is the authority of this practice, of praying for the dead, acknowledged by a prelate of our own church, who, for promoting the general peace of the Chriſtian world, had taken pains to look into antiquity; thus he delivers his ſenſe, and lays grounds for a good accommodation of this point; which yet, according to our fifth rule, ought not to be made the oc-

caſion of ſeparation; ſince, though not in ſcripture, yet it is not contrary to, or forbid in ſcripture.

*Queſt.* V. Whether the church of *Rome*, aſſerting a purgatory, has not given ſufficient cauſe for a ſeparation, eſpecially ſince ſhe requires all to aſſent to it?

This point of purgatory, is one of thoſe, which, in *terms*, we cannot well ſubſcribe, according to what is delivered in our articles. But having ſeparated all ſuperſtitions, abuſes and corruptions, relating to this point, which are deſervedly condemned; what remains, ſeems a diſpute about words, and ſo far at leaſt, according to our third rule, it ought not to be made the occaſion of ſeparating communion.

Now, I wiſh the thing were calmly conſidered, to ſee, if ſomething of this debate be not more of terms, than of real difference. The reaſon I have, is this; I ſee great men in our church hold a kind of third place, or a third ſtate of ſouls. Biſhop *Montague*, *Appeal*, *c.* 18. aſſerts ſuch a ſtate of all the ſouls of the righteous, before Chriſt's aſcenſion; for he ſays poſitively, they were not in heaven,

ven, *ſtrictly* taken, not in that heaven, which is now the receptacle of the righteous. Many others maintain a ſtate peculiar to the righteous, in which they wait till the day of judgment, and then are to receive the accompliſhments of their happineſs. Now this ſeems to own a third ſtate, which is neither hell, nor yet that heaven, which is generally underſtood by that name. Now if there can be allowed a third ſtate, the difference then cannot be very great.

It is true, here is no mention yet of puniſhment, and therefore but little reſemblance with purgatory. But if we take in here what biſhop *Forbes* ſuppoſes in his diſcourſe now mentioned, it will come ſomething nearer. For in his *third ſtate* (taught, as he ſays, in the primitive church) he ſuppoſes the *guilt of leſſer ſins*, and likewiſe a *forgiveneſs* of ſuch ſins, by the prayers of the church. Now this cannot well be ſuppoſed to be any part of heaven, ſince *nothing that defileth* can enter there; and it is contrary to the general notion of heaven, to think it capable of ſin. Neither can it be hell, becauſe there is no forgiveneſs: Muſt it not therefore be a ſtate capable of ſin, which

is not heaven, and capable of forgiveneſs, which is not hell? And how far does this come ſhort of purgatory? Eſpecially ſince ſuch ſouls, while under the guilt of thoſe leſſer ſins, in which they die, cannot be admitted to the viſion of God, and conſequently have the puniſhment of *privation*, which is of all, the greateſt, till by the interceſſion of the church, ſuch guilt is remitted. Thus by deduction, we are come to a third ſtate, and even of puniſhment, as taught by biſhop *Forbes*, from the authority of holy fathers, and councils. Beſides, the uſual forms of wiſhing the dead *peace*, *light* and *refreſhment*, together with *mercy*, ſhew a place or ſtate of *uneaſineſs*. And even in our *litany*, as the *middle ſtate* is evident in the prayer for deliverance in the hour of *death*, and in the day of judgment; inſomuch, that *between* death, and the day of judgment, there muſt be ſome ſtate, out of which we pray to be delivered at that great, and laſt-day: So the *afflictive part* is plainly implied in the word *deliver*, which is always from ſomething *diſagreeable* to us. If then we can go thus far in our communion, the *Roman* church

church will here meet us: For though they generally ſpeak of purgatory fire, yet, upon due enquiry, I find, this fire is no more than the common opinion of their divines, but no where defined, as of faith, either in the council of *Florence*, or *Trent*, in both which purgatory is defined, without mention of fire; nay, the *Greeks* oppoſed this opinion in the council of *Florence*, as is related out of *Bellarmin*, by *Veron* (*Rule of Faith, of Purgat.*), and yet without any breach of communion upon this account. Hence ſince this point of purgatory fire is only an opinion, and not impoſed on any, according to our ſecond rule it ought not to be inſiſted on; and hence is a way made here, which gives ſome hopes of peace.

*Queſt.* VI. Whether ſuch a ſtate, or place as purgatory, being no where mentioned in ſcripture, be not reaſon enough for ever to ſtand againſt it?

Our church has not undertaken to reform to the letter of the ſcripture, but to the pure primitive church of Chriſt, which is the beſt expoſitor of ſcripture, and likewiſe the beſt witneſs of all that was taught by the apoſtles. Hence our moſt

moſt eminent prelates expreſs a reverence, and even ſubmiſſion to what that primitive church has delivered to us, though no where mentioned in holy writ. As biſhop *Forbes* in this chapter, about praying for the dead; biſhop *Gunning*, in his treatiſe of *Lent*, proving it to be apoſtolical, though no where expreſſed in ſcripture; and our whole church has given authority to this, in receiving the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian creeds*, with all their contents, though no where mentioned in ſcripture. Nay, the Goſpel itſelf encourages it, while it aſſures us, That all things are not written: And St. *Paul*, in giving this charge to the *Theſſalonians: Therefore, brethren, ſtand faſt, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epiſtle*, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 15. Hence biſhop *Montague* aſſerting a third ſtate of pious ſouls, before Chriſt's aſcenſion, and having put this objection, *There's no ſuch place mentioned in ſcripture:* Anſwers it thus; Though there be no third place mentioned in ſcripture, yet it would not follow hence, that there was no ſuch place, becauſe there are many things, which are not expreſſed in ſcripture.

ſcripture. Then as to the texts, which ſeem to reſtrain the ſtate of departed ſouls, either to Hell, or Heaven, he ſays, This is to be underſtood of the final ſtate of ſouls, after the day of judgment, when there will be no more than two conditions of ſouls everlaſting, *viz.* Heaven and Hell; and in this both churches agree. *Appar. p.* 135. Hence a third place, or ſtate, being not expreſſed in ſcripture, ought not to be the cauſe of ſeparation; eſpecially, if ſuch a ſtate is evidently conſequent to what was taught by the primitive church, as ſeems to be, from what has been recited out of biſhop *Forbes*.

---

## CHAP. VIII.

### *Of Penances, Indulgences, and the Number of Sacraments.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER penances are of good uſe, and neceſſary, or fit to be enjoined for ſins?

Of this there needs be no diſpute, ſince this ancient diſcipline is allowed, and

and earneſtly wiſhed for in the *Commination*, which is to be read yearly on the firſt day of Lent: And I have heard, that King *Charles* II. upon this occaſion, uſed to aſk with ſome wonder, who it was that hindered the reſtoring thereof.

*Queſt.* II. Whether indulgences are not abominable, which either give leave to ſin, or grant the pardon of paſt ſins, and theſe obtained for a ſum of money?

This was the opinion I formerly had of indulgences; but ſince I began to follow other meaſures, beſides taking upon truſt, upon diligent examination, I have found, that *indulgences* in the church of *Rome*, are neither pardons for ſin, nor leave to commit ſin, but the ſame which has been practiſed in the pureſt ages of the church; and that is, a remiſſion of ſome part of thoſe canonical penances, which were wont to be inflicted for ſome greater crimes. This power of binding and looſing, we own in the church, and retain it in our canons; and it is yet in force, in reſpect of ſome crimes. And Dr. *Cave* ſhews it to have been practiſed in the primitive church. *Prim. Chriſt. p.* 3. *c.* 5. *p.* 369. 374. The church of

*Rome*

*Rome* propoſes no more in her definitions of faith, than that *the power of granting indulgences is given to the church by Jeſus Chriſt, and the uſe of them beneficial to the faithful.*

This is all that is propoſed, as a term of communion by that church, which being according to the doctrine of our own, I do not ſee any reaſon to divide upon this account; eſpecially, ſince the council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 21. *de Reform.* in its decree of indulgences, refers to antiquity, and to what has been eſtabliſhed by ancient ſynods: In which nothing more was taught beſides the diſpenſing, upon due motives, with the rigour of diſcipline; for by this it appears, there is no other meaning of indulgences impoſed upon any, beſides that which was primitive, and we ſtill retain.

Theſe indulgences, having been formerly called *pardons*, I preſume, has been the occaſion of their having been reputed pardons for ſins; and whereas *giving of alms* has been generally one condition required for gaining ſuch indulgences; hence has it been thought, that the par-

don

don of ſin was offered for money. But upon enquiry, I find theſe to be miſtakes. For all books of doctrine in the church of *Rome* unanimouſly teach, that there is no pardon of ſin, without true repentance, and an humble confeſſion of ſin; and if theſe do not precede, no *indulgence* can avail them, in order to the pardon of their ſin. In this I am certain we join, and they require no more, for our joining with them; and therefore, as to this point, I ſee great hopes of an amicable accord.

*Queſt.* III. Whether the granting indulgences for many thouſand years, and ſuch as are found in many books, of many years pardon, with the releaſe of a ſoul out of purgatory, granted for ſaying one ſhort prayer, or wearing ſome medal, be not ſcandal enough to diſcourage all men of ſenſe from joining with the church of *Rome?*

The canonical penances of the primitive church, I obſerve, were for many years, whence it cannot be wondered, if the tenor of indulgences, which are the releaſe of ſuch penalties, be for many years. But as to the thouſand years pardons,

pardons, with the reſt now mentioned, there are none of theſe offered by any general council, nor have place in any profeſſion of faith, and therefore being not impoſed on any, though never ſo corrupt, yet, according to our ſecond rule, they are not to obſtruct communion, ſince joining in communion with that church, does not oblige to conſent to, or approve any ſuch practices. It being as common in that church to diſapprove the conceſſion of indulgences for frivolous cauſes, and ſome ſlight work, as by others that are out of it.

*Queſt.* IV. Whether the doctrine of indulgences, was not that, which obliged *Luther* to depart from the church, and undertake a reformation? How then can the reformation join with it?

By the beſt account of hiſtory, I find, there had been great abuſes in this point of indulgences, ſuch as were not leſs injurious than provoking; ſo that I do not wonder at *Luther*, in making a party againſt them, but think, he had deſerved the applauſe of the Chriſtian world, had he done it in a canonical way. But I find too, he was not the only perſon

that

that expreſſed a zeal againſt ſuch corrupt practices. Pope *Innocent* II. had long before complained of them in the great *Lateran* council, laying the intolerable abuſes, on the *Queſtors*, or collectors in thoſe days. *Clement* V. in the council at *Vienna*, *an.* 1311, cenſures the evil practices of thoſe times much more, and makes a ſevere order againſt the wicked miniſters, and under-officers of the inferior clergy, to whom the publiſhing of indulgences, and collection of the people's alms, for ſome public and pious uſes, was committed. He expoſes their crime, in undertaking with much raſhneſs, and the deluſion of ſouls, to grant indulgences, to releaſe penances, and deceitfully to promiſe to thoſe that gave them alms, the releaſe of three or four of their parents or friends ſouls out of purgatory; repreſenting them as great liars and cheats: and then taking care to put an effectual ſtop to all ſuch abuſes. But this is beſt ſeen in the words of the conſtitution.

Having given this character of theſe *Quæſtores: Illos in ſuis prædicationibus ſimplices decipere, & aurum extorquere, in animarum*

*marum periculum, & plurimorum ſcandalum.* He then goes on thus: *Cum aliqui ex hujuſmodi Quæſtoribus, ſicut ad noſtram audientiam eſt perlatum, non ſine multa temeritatis audacia, deceptione multiplici animarum, indulgentias populo, motu ſuo proprio, de facto concedant; ſuper votis diſpenſent; in perjurijs, homicidijs, & peccatis alijs ſibi confitentes abſolvant; male ablata incerta (data ſibi aliqua pecuniæ quantitate) remittant; tertiam, aut quartam partem de pœnitentijs injunctis relaxent; animas tres, vel plures parentum, vel amicorum illorum, qui eleemoſynas eis conferunt, de Purgatorio (ut aſſerunt mendaciter) extrahant, & ad gaudia Paradiſi perducant; benefactoribus locorum, quorum Quæſtores exiſtunt, remiſſionem plenariam peccatorum indulgeant; & aliqui ex ipſis, eos a pœna & a culpa (ut eorum verbis utamur) abſolvant. Nos abuſus hujuſmodi omnimode aboleri volentes, inhibemus. Conſtit. Clem. l. 5. tit. 9. c. 2.*

Here is confeſſed the origin of thoſe extravagant indulgencies above mentioned, and care taken for removing the grand abuſes, by which thoſe trading queſtors had impoſed upon the people, and moſt ſcandalouſly enriched themſelves.

ſelves. This care might probably have ſome effect; but where covetouſneſs had ſo great a prey, the cure was not laſting: The like abuſes returned again, and were thoſe with which the church was deformed in *Luther*'s days. Now had the church of *Rome* undertaken to juſtify and defend ſuch abuſes, his arming the ſtate againſt the church, might have had ſome colour. But although there did not appear that zeal for ſo timely a reforming them, as the ſcandals ſeemed to require, yet as *Clement* had done before, ſo did the paſtors of the church afterwards, lament thoſe corruptions, and take more effectual care for their being removed, and their return prevented.

For the council of *Trent*, complaining of the fruitleſs endeavours of precedent councils, quite abrogated this office of *Queſtors*, and in abhorrence of their ſcandals, wholly aboliſhed their name, with all the privileges belonging to them; and committed the publiſhing of ſuch indulgences, and collecting charities, to the *ordinary*, with two of the chapter joined with him, to be done,

*nulla*

*nulla prorſus Mercede accepta.* Seſſ. 21. c. 9.

And then for reforming all abuſes, ſee what decree it has made: *Seſſ.* 25, *c.* 21. *Decr. de Indul.*

" The holy ſynod deſires, that moderation be uſed in granting indulgences, according to the antient and approved cuſtom in the church, leſt by too much facility, eccleſiaſtical diſcipline be weakened. And being ſolicitous, that abuſes, which have crept in, be reformed and corrected, which have given occaſion to heretics, of blaſpheming the venerable name of indulgences; it ordains in general, by this preſent decree, that all wicked lucre for obtaining them, which has been the cauſe of many great abuſes amongſt the faithful, be wholly aboliſhed. And, as for all other abuſes, which are occaſioned by ſuperſtition, ignorance, irreverence, or from what other cauſe ſoever, ſince they cannot be here in particular forbid, by reaſon of the manifold corruptions of places and provinces, in which they are committed; therefore the ſynod ſtrictly enjoins all biſhops, to take a particular liſt of ſuch abuſes, in their

their reſpective dioceſſes, and give in a memorial of them, to the firſt provincial ſynod; that being acknowledged by the ſentence of other biſhops, they may be forthwith laid before the biſhop of *Rome*; by whoſe authority and prudence, may be ordained what may be expedient for the whole church."

Thus ſtands this point of indulgences, which has been attended with great abuſes: But ſince the church of *Rome*, maintains not ſuch abuſes, but joins with *Luther*, and the reſt of the reformation, in uſing means for their being removed, we ought not to make ſuch abuſes an exception againſt communion, but, according to our ſecond rule, lay aſide this queſtion.

*Queſt.* V. Whether the number of ſeven ſacraments in the church of *Rome*, be not a juſt exception againſt communion?

This ſeems a diſpute principally about a *term*, and therefore, according to our third rule, not ſufficient to obſtruct communion. We all agree, that a ſacrament is a viſible ſign of inward and ſpiritual grace. Now, though the queſtion be

be aſked in our church-catechiſm, *How many ſacraments has Chriſt ordained in his church?* And the anſwer is thus made: *Two only, as generally neceſſary to ſalvation:* Yet this does not exclude others from that name and deſignation, though from the prerogative and degree; ſo that, although there be but two, *as generally neceſſary to ſalvation*, yet it is conſiſtent with our church's doctrine, to allow of others, not thus neceſſary, but of an inferior prerogative and degree. This is biſhop *Montague*'s expoſition of this article in terms. *Appeal to Cæſ. c. 33.* Where he quotes *Calvin*, acknowledging *ordination* to be a ſacrament: *Sacramentum eſſe concedo; ſed inter ordinaria ſacramenta non numero.* Upon which, biſhop *Montague* ſays this: *No papiſt living, I think, will ſay, or deſire more. It is not for all, but for ſome.* Now if this will ſtand good in our church, it will likewiſe ſtand in the Roman communion, it being the very doctrine they teach; as may be ſeen in the catechiſm, *ad Paroch. p. 2. de Sacram.* §. 19. Where are theſe words: *Illud vero Maxime advertendum eſt, quamvis omnia ſacramenta divinam, & ad-*

*& admirabilem virtutem in ſe contineant, tamen non parem omnia, & æqualem neceſſitatem, aut dignitatem, aut unam, eandemque ſignificandi vim habere.* Which is the ſenſe of the biſhop's words now given. Whence it may be hoped, that this point may be accommodated, as having more difference in terms, than in ſubſtance.

---

## CHAP. IX.

### *Of Confeſſion, Repentance, and the Pardon of Sin.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER it be not abominable ſacrilege in the church of *Rome*, to go to men for the pardon of ſin, whilſt in ſo doing, they forſake God for man?

Upon examination into this point, I find the Romaniſts believe as firmly as we do, that there is no power but of God alone, can forgive ſins: And that, where God has made men the miniſters of his power, there to go to ſuch his miniſters, is not to forſake God, or to ſeek any other power, beſides of God; but it is to comply with his ordinance, and

and conſequently the direct way of ſeeking God; ſince doing his will is the moſt effectual way of going to him. He that hears you, hears me. Thus they; hence if any fix this upon them, of forſaking God, it is a conſequence which they expreſsly diſown; and therefore, according to our fourth rule, ought not to be preſſed, ſo as to make this the cauſe of a breach between us, eſpecially in a point, in which the two churches agree in ſo many particulars.

For, *Firſt*, We allow of confeſſion. It is adviſed in the *exhortation* giving warning of a *communion*; and more particularly, a *ſpecial confeſſion* is urged in the rubric, at the *viſitation of the ſick*. But if not requiſite, why is the dying perſon to be then alarmed and troubled therewith, when leaſt capable to reflect upon his paſt life. Hear biſhop *Montague*: Private confeſſion unto a Prieſt, is of very antient practice in the church, of excellent uſe and benefit; being diſcreetly handled. We refuſe it to none, if men require it, if need be to have it; we urge and perſuade it *in extremis*: We require it in the caſe of perplexity,

for the quieting of men diſturbed, and their conſciences. *Appeal. c.* 32.

*Secondly*, We approve of *abſolution*, and uſe the very ſame form as the church of *Rome*. *By his authority committed to me, I abſolve thee from all thy ſins.* And though many with us, own this ſentence to be no more than *declarative*, yet in our church, it is held to be *abſolute* and *judiciary*; as by Dr. *Comber*, in his expoſition of the Common-Prayer, and others. At leaſt we own the power of the keys, as biſhop *Andrews*, in his prayer: *Giving me good hopes of the remiſſion of my ſins, by repentance, and by the good works thereof, through the power of the moſt holy keys, and ſacraments in thy church.* Man. of Priv. Devot.

*Thirdly*, The ſame learned prelate ſeems to plead even the neceſſity of making application to the prieſts of the church: In his *Court Sermon, on Jo.* 20. 23. *Quorum remiſeritis peccata.* We are not, ſays he, the ordinance of God thus ſtanding, to rend off one part of the ſentence: Three are here expreſſed, three perſons: 1. The perſon of the *ſinner* in *quorum*; 2. Of God, in *remittuntur*; 3. Of the prieſt,

prieſt, in *remiſeritis*. Three are expreſſed; and where three are expreſſed, three are required; and where three are required, two are not enough. It is St. *Auguſtin*, that thus ſpeaketh of this eccleſiaſtical act in his time; *Nemo ſibi dicat*, Let nobody ſay within himſelf, I repent in private, I repent before God: God, who pardons me, knows I repent from my heart: Then to no purpoſe was it ſaid, Whatſoever you ſhall looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heaven: Then to no purpoſe were the keys given to the church of God; we make void the goſpel, we make void the words of Chriſt. Thus this biſhop, and then takes notice, that in the ordination of prieſts, are theſe very words: *Quorum remiſeritis peccata: Whoſe ſins you ſhall forgive, they are forgiven.* And then adds: God ordinarily proceedeth, in remitting ſin, by the church's act. And hence they have their parts in this work, and cannot be excluded; no more in this, than in other acts, and parts of their function. And to exclude them, is (after a ſort) to wring the keys out of their hands, to whom Chriſt hath given them; is to cancel,

and make void this clauſe of *remiſeritis*, as if it were no part of the ſentence; to account of all this ſolemn ſending, and inſpiring, as if it were an idle and fruitleſs ceremony.

Now this being a doctrine ſo much approved, and there being an agreement in ſo many particulars, there ſeems reaſon to hope, that means may be found to accommodate this point between the two churches.

*Queſt.* II. Whether it be not impoſſible to cloſe with a church, which requires no repentance for the pardon of ſin, but running to a prieſt, and confeſſing, which is enough for the worſt of crimes, and encourages penitents to believe all well, though immediately they return to the vomit, repeating the ſame wickedneſs, which they had but juſt confeſſed?

None, that are ſerious in Chriſtianity can cloſe with ſuch doctrine; for it is certainly abominable. As to matter of fact, I cannot ſay how far this may be the practice of hardened ſinners. But as to matter of doctrine, I can poſitively ſay, this is not the doctrine of the church

church of *Rome*. For having examined both their councils, public catechiſms, prayer books, and other practical treatiſes, I find the point of repentence is as ſtrictly preſſed, and a true converſion with amendment of life declared as neceſſary for the pardon of ſin, by them in that church, as it is, or can be by us. For this I produce the council of *Trent. Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 4. where (it being declared, that *contrition* is the firſt act, which belongs to a penitent, who deſires to make his peace with God) contrition is thus deſcribed, *Contritio animi dolor, ac deteſtatio eſt de peccato commiſſo, cum propoſito non peccandi de cætero*, &c. Contrition is a grief and deteſtation of the mind for ſin committed, with a purpoſe of ſinning no more. Now this contrition has been at all times neceſſary for obtaining pardon of ſin; and in a man falling after baptiſm, it ſo prepares for the remiſſion of ſin, if it be joined with a confidence in the divine mercy, and a deſire of performing what other things are required for this ſacrament. Wherefore the holy ſynod declares, that contrition does not only comprehend a ceaſing from ſin,

with the purpoſe, and beginning of a new life, but likewiſe a hatred of the old, according to that of the prophet, Caſt away from you all your iniquities, in which you have prevaricated; and make to yourſelves a new heart and a new ſpirit. For certainly, whoever conſiders thoſe cries of the ſaints: To thee only have I ſinned, and have done evil before thee: I have laboured with groaning: I will every night water my bed *with tears:* will call over my paſt years in the bitterneſs of my ſoul; with others like, will eaſily perceive, that a vehement hatred of the paſt life, and great adhorrence of ſin, has been the ſpring, from whence they flowed. It declares likewiſe, that imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, becauſe it commonly ariſes either from the conſideration of the foulneſs of ſin, or from the fear of puniſhment, *Si voluntatem peccandi excludat, cum ſpe veniæ*; if it turns the will from ſin with the hopes of mercy, does not make a man a hypocrite, and greater ſinner, but is the gift of God. And again, *c.* 8, as to impoſing penances, the council gives this direction: Let prieſts be

be mindful, that the penance they preſcribe, be not only for being faithful in in a new life, and the cure of weakneſs, but alſo for the revenge and puniſhment of paſt ſins.

The ſame doctrine is repeated at large in the catechiſm *ad Parochos*, in which the people are to be inſtructed; and where theſe particulars are inculcated: 1. That contrition for ſin ought to be a grief of all the greateſt; becauſe ſins turn the heart from God, and therefore are above all things to be deteſted; and this proved from ſeveral reaſons. 2. That the penitent ought to deteſt not only ſome, but all his ſins: expreſſed thus; *Primum neceſſe eſt, peccata omnia, quæ admiſſimus, odiſſe, & dolere.* It is declared to be neceſſary. 3. That the penitent ought to engage in a firm and ſtable reſolution of amending his life: And this preſſed from many texts of ſcripture, to ſhew, that it is what is expreſsly required by God himſelf, and a condition neceſſary to be obſerved; with much more at length. *De Sacram. Pœnit. Par.* 35, &c.

This is the general tenor of all their books, which give directions for repentance and confeſſion; and it being a point of greateſt concern, and in which, I had a great mind to be perfectly ſatisfied, I therefore examined all the books I could hear of, compoſed in ſeveral nations, for the uſe of the people, which have been made Engliſh: As *Rodericus*, a Spaniard; *Segnori*, an Italian; the *Spiritual Director*, a Frenchman; beſides others of our own nation. And in this they all with one voice concur: That a ſincere repentance is abſolutely neceſſary for the pardon of ſin; and that no confeſſion is to any purpoſe, if it be not accompanied with a real deteſtation of ſin, and a ſincere reſolution of a new life. The book laſt mentioned, may ſerve for all, to give ſatisfaction in this point, *chap.* 15, 16. Where this doctrine is delivered: That confeſſion can be to no purpoſe, if it be not accompanied with certain interior diſpoſitions, ſet down in the ſcripture. The firſt is a ſincere regret and compunction, for the ſins we confeſs. The ſecond is, a firm reſolution, to correct and amend them.

It

It is plain, ſays he, theſe two diſpoſitions are of abſolute neceſſity; for it is impoſſible, that God ſhall pardon a ſin, which the ſinner does not deteſt. So long as the love of our ſins remains in us, ſo long likewiſe does the guilt; nor can all the confeſſing in the world diſcharge us of it.

Now this being the profeſſed doctrine of the church of *Rome*, the corrupt practices of hypocrites, or ſinners, or the opinions of ſome ſchoolmen, ought not to be made an objection againſt communion, according to our ſecond rule, ſince communicating with the church, requires no communication, but rather a deteſtation of ſuch evil practices.

*Queſt.* III. Whether the doctrine of a death-bed repentance in the church of *Rome*, be not abominable, which is ſuch an encouragement to a ſinful life, and afford ſuch aſſurance, upon the uncertainty of what is done at the laſt moment?

I have ſpared no labour neceſſary for a true information in this point; and upon enquiry, have certainly found,

that the church of *Rome*, both in practice and doctrine, joins with us. It is true, if any ſinner at the laſt hour, makes profeſſion, or gives ſigns of repentance, they refuſe not abſolution, becauſe they know not the heart; and therefore, in the hour of diſtreſs, hoping the beſt, they let charity direct them in favour of the penitent.

But while they act thus charitably with dying perſons, yet they diſcourage all from depending on ſuch repentance; they ſhew the danger of delays in turning to God; they ſhew the uncertainty of all that is done on a death-bed; and this ſo fully, that we cannot ſay more on this ſubject, than what is delivered in their family books. See this in the *Chriſtian Directory*, part 2, c. 7. Where are employed no leſs than fifty pages, to ſhew the danger of delaying repentance, and of the great uncertainty of whatever is done at the laſt hour of ſinners. The ſame is preſſed in a ſmaller volume, *A contrite and humble Heart*: Where one principal head is the *Danger of Delay*; and in twenty pages is ſaid enough to diſcourage any ſinner from the

the confidence of what is to be done on a death-bed. But I need not appeal to private authors, when the council of *Trent* declares the difficulty of a new life, which belongs to confeſſion, to be ſo great, that none can have hopes of coming to it, *Sine magnis noſtris fletibus, & laboribus*; without earneſt tears, and great labour: And in another place, That the whole life of a Chriſtian, ought to be a life of penance. For while this is required, the encouragement is but very little to thoſe who begin at the laſt hour, when perſons are generally diſabled, and made unfit for doing any thing.

Whatever therefore be the practical abuſes, it is certain the doctrine of that church is very ſound, as to what belongs to repentance; and therefore according to our ſecond rule, theſe queſtions ought to be no occaſion of ſeparate communion.

CHAP.

## CHAP. X.

### *Of Merit, Satisfaction, Works of Supererogation, and Relics.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER it be not a damnable preſumption in the Romaniſts to truſt in their own merits, and ſo to confide in the value of their own works, as to demand heaven as their due?

This doctrine of merit ſounds very ill, but upon a full enquiry, the diſpute ſeems to be more about *words*, than any real difference between the two churches. For what the church of *Rome* means by *merit*, is no more than this: That God gives grace to do many good works, to which he has promiſed a reward: As may be ſeen at length, in the council of *Trent*. *Seſſ.* 6. c. 16. Where are brought proofs of ſcripture, to ſhew the promiſes God has made to ſuch as perſevere to the end, in working righteouſneſs, and keeping his commandments.

Now, as to the very power, by which any is enabled to do good, they declare alſo there as we do, that it is all from the grace of God, through *Jeſus Chriſt*, which goes before, accompanies, and follows

follows every good work, and without which, nothing can find acceptance with God. And when they have done all they can do, through the divine grace, they ſay again, as we do, that they are not to glory, nor confide in themſelves, but in the pure mercy of God. Hear how the council of *Trent* expreſſes it:

Although the holy Scripture promiſes eternal rewards to thoſe that do good. *Abſit tamen, ut Chriſtianus homo in ſeipſo vel confidat, vel glorietur, & non in Domino.* Nevertheleſs far be it from a chriſtian to confide, or glory in himſelf, and not in our Lord: whoſe goodneſs is ſo great towards all men, that he will have that to be their merits, which is his own gift. And becauſe, in many things we all offend; therefore every one as he conſiders the mercy and goodneſs of God, ſo he ought likewiſe to have before his eyes his ſeverity and judgment; and not make a full judgment of himſelf, even although he be not conſcious to himſelf of any guilt; becauſe the whole life of man is to be examined and judged, not by the judgment of men, but of God, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkneſs, and manifeſt the ſecrets of hearts.

hearts. After this declaration the cenſure is there added, *Can.* 26. If any one ſhall ſay, that the juſt for thoſe good works, which are done in God, ought not to expect, and hope for an eternal recompence from God, through his mercy, and the merit of Jeſus Chriſt, if he perſeveres to the end, doing well, and keeping the divine law; let him be anathema.

This is the ſenſe of that church. And hence, ſince they teach, that they can do no good, but through the grace of God; that the reward, which God promiſes, is the effect of his goodneſs and bounty; that nothing can be accepted, but through Chriſt: and that when they have done all they can, they are ſtill to go on in the fear of God's judgments; let us conſider that all this, is alſo the doctrine of our church: And while we agree in the ſubſtance of our doctrine, the term of *merit*, which they uſe, ought not, according to our third rule, make a difference between us.

If farther ſatisfaction be required in this point, it may be had in *Rodriguez. Treat.* 3. of *Humil.* C. 30, 31. Where he

he declares, that it is an article of faith, that we have nothing of our own ſtock, but ſin; and that we hold all the reſt from God's bounty, to whom ought to be aſcribed the glory of all we have received; and not to ourſelves, but to God alone, the author and diſpenſer of all good. That we can do nothing of ourſelves, when ſeparated from the true vine, who is Chriſt Jeſus. That of ourſelves, we are good for nothing, but as dead branches, to be burnt; and if we are any thing, *It is by the grace of God that we are what we are.* Hence we are not to impute any thing to ourſelves, nor rely any way upon our own ſtrength, but aſcribe all to God. And (*c.* 32.) as life and motion are not to be attributed to the body, but to the ſoul, that animates it; ſo the ſoul muſt not aſcribe to itſelf the good actions it does, but to God alone, who quickens it by his grace, and gives it the means to perform them. We muſt have a continual diffidence of ourſelves, and an entire confidence in God. And when we have done all that depends on us, we are obliged to confide no more therein, than as if we had done nothing; we

we muſt look upon ourſelves as unprofitable ſervants, and put our confidence in God alone, according to theſe words of our Saviour: When ye have done all that is commanded ye, ſay ſtill, ye are unprofitable ſervants. Thus is this doctrine taught, and repeated by a Jeſuit, whoſe works are in all languages, for the inſtruction of all. The ſame is taught in ſhort, in the *Following of Chriſt*, which is in the hands of all. *L.* 2. *C.* 11. And when he has done all that he knows to be done, let him think he has done nothing. Let him not weigh that much, which might be much eſteemed, but according to truth, let him affirm himſelf to be an unprofitable ſervant, as our Saviour has ſaid. Here the doctrine appears the ſame we teach, and therefore the difference of terms ought not to ſeparate communions.

*Queſt.* II. Whether it be not a doctrine of great preſumption in the church of *Rome*, and very injurious to the paſſion of Chriſt, to teach people, that by their own works, they may make ſatisfaction for their ſins, by which they have provoked God's anger againſt them?

This

This ſeems to be another diſpute, like the former, about a term. For having made enquiry into this point, I find, that though this be a common way of ſpeaking among their authors, yet they mean no more than what we may approve; and that they expreſsly diſown all things in this doctrine, which can be injurious to Chriſt. Hear how the council of *Trent* declares it. *Seſſ.* 14. *c.* 8:

Neither has there been any other way judged more ſecure in the church of God, for turning away the divine chaſtiſements, than for men to be aſſiduous in performing thoſe works of penance with a true grief of mind. Moreover, while by making ſatisfaction, we ſuffer for our ſins, we are conformed to Chriſt Jeſus, who ſatisfied for our ſins, and from whom is all our ſufficiency; whence alſo we have a certain pledge, that if we ſuffer with him, we ſhall be glorified with him. Neither is this ſatisfaction, we perform for our ſins, ſo ours, that it is not through Jeſus Chriſt. For, we, who of ourſelves, as of ourſelves, can do nothing, are able to do all things through

through him, who works together with us, and ſtrengthens us. Whence man has nothing, wherein to glory: But all our glorying is in Chriſt, in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we ſatisfy; bringing forth worthy fruits of penance, which have their efficacy from him, which are offered by him to the Father, and through him are accepted by the Father. And by theſe ſatisfactions, no catholic ever yet thought, that the efficacy of the merit, and ſatisfaction of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was either blemiſhed, or any way leſſened.

Thus the council ſpeaks of ſatisfaction; and while they derive all from Chriſt, and confeſs, with us, that they can do nothing of themſelves, and that whatever acceptance their penitential works find with God, it is not from any thing they do, but only and wholly through the merit and paſſion of Chriſt, it ſeems to be a doctrine little different from us, except only in *terms*, which, according to our third rule, ought to make no difference of communion. And if the doctrine be different, yet ſince they diſown whatever can be injurious to the

paſſion

paſſion of Chriſt, this conſequence, according to our fourth rule, ought not to be preſſed upon them, ſo as to become the occaſion, or warrant for juſtifying a ſeparation.

*Queſt.* III. Whether it does not betray an intolerable pride and confidence in the *Romaniſts*, to think they can do more than God requires at their hands, and more than is neceſſary, which they call *works of ſupererogation?*

I have carefully weighed their profeſſion of faith, and find not ſo much as a hint of this doctrine, neither can I ſee any footſtep of it in the council of *Trent*; whence I have reaſon to judge it to be no more than a *ſchool opinion*, which, according to our firſt rule, ought not to make a difference of communion: Or, at leaſt, is not impoſed on any, and therefore, by our ſecond rule, is to be laid aſide. Though, if I apprehend it aright, it means no more, than we may approve, that is, the performance of ſuch good works, which God has not required of us by any precept; ſuch as it was in *Mary Magdalen*, when falling at the feet of Jeſus in the Phariſee's houſe, ſhe anointed

anointed them with ointment, having firſt waſhed them with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. Repentance and love of Chriſt was commanded, but this her manner of expreſſing it, ſo acceptable to Jeſus, was not commanded, and hence it is termed by them a work of ſupererogation; and if no more be meant by it, the difference can be only about a term, which, according to our third rule, ought not to make a difference.

*Queſt.* IV. Whether the doctrine and practice of the church of *Rome*, as to relics, be not abominable, while they place ſo much confidence in them, and abuſe the world with ſo many counterfeit and ridiculous things, for the relics of ſaints?

Their profeſſion of faith ſays no more than, *Reliquias eſſe venerandas, That the relics of ſaints are to be venerated.* And while they expound, and declare this to be no more, than what is given to other holy things, as to the *ſacred veſſels*, &c. It ſeems not contrary to the doctrine of our church, which allows a veneration to holy things, and therefore may give hopes of being ſo compounded, as to make

make no occaſion of a ſeparate communion.

But now, as to all abuſes, and ridiculous impoſtures in this point, the church of *Rome* requires no approbation of them. Rather, I ſee, ſhe has joined with the reformation, in expreſſing her diſlike againſt them, and given ſtrict charge to her paſtors, to be watchful in removing all ſuch ſuperſtitions and abuſes. This ſhe has done in the council of *Trent, Seſſ. 25. de Invoc.* Where having made ſeveral decrees, concerning the images of Chriſt, and of holy relics, is added this general order: *In has autem ſanctas & ſalutares obſervationes, ſiqui abuſus irrepſerint, eos prorſus aboleri ſancta ſynodus vehementer cupit.* If any abuſes have crept into theſe holy and wholeſome obſervations, the ſynod moſt earneſtly deſires, they ſhould be wholly aboliſhed. Again more expreſsly; *Omnis porro ſuperſtitio in ſanctorum invocatione, reliquiarum veneratione, & imaginum ſacro uſu tollatur, omnis turpis quæſtus eliminetur.* Moreover, let all kind of ſuperſtition in the invocation of ſaints, in the veneration of relics, in the ſacred uſe of images, be taken away,

away, and all filthy lucre be rooted out. Then follows a decree: *Hæc ut fidelius obſerventur, ſtatuit Sancta Synodus, nulla admittenda eſſe nova miracula, nec novas reliquias recipiendas, niſi recognoſcente, & approbante epiſcopo, qui ſimul atque de iis aliquid compertum habuerit, adhibitis in concilium theologis, & aliis piis viris, ea faciat, quæ veritati & pietati conſentanea judicaverit.* That thoſe things may be more faithfully obſerved, the holy ſynod decrees, That no new miracles are to be admitted, nor any new relics to be received, but with the examination, and approbation of the biſhop, who having found any thing certain in them, let him conſult with divines and other pious men, and then do what he ſhall judge agreeable to truth and piety.

In this manner does that church expreſs itſelf in this point, ſo that as to oppoſing and rooting out all ſuperſtition and abuſes in this matter, the two churches agree, while both are for the reformation of them. And yet if there be ſuch abuſes ſtill remaining unreformed, as long as they are not impoſed on any by that church, this ought not to be

be the occaſion of any breach between us, according to our ſecond rule.

## CHAP. XI.

*Of breeding People in Ignorance, of Praying in an unknown Tongue, and forbidding the Bible in the vulgar Tongue.*

*Queſt.* I. MUST not the communion with the Roman church be unlawful, which profeſſedly breeds up her people in ignorance, hides from them the knowledge of their greateſt duties, and preaches to them in an unknown tongue?

I have taken a full information of this point, and have found upon due enquiry, that the church of *Rome* is both deſirous and ſolicitous, that all in her communion ſhould be duly inſtructed, in all duties which belong to ſalvation; eſpecially in the commandments, in the creed, in the ſacraments, in the Lord's prayer, and ſuch other obligations, which the goſpel lays upon all believers.

This is what that church requires, and accordingly the council of *Trent*. *Seſſ.*

*Seſſ.* 24. *de Reform.* c. 4. commands all biſhops, that ſermons be preached to the people both in their cathedrals and in pariſh churches, on all Sundays and ſolemn feſtivals; that in Lent and Advent, the word of God, and the divine law be preached every day, or at leaſt thrice a week, if they ſhall judge it convenient; that the people be admoniſhed of their obligation of going to their pariſh church to hear the word of God. The biſhops are likewiſe to ſee that on Sundays and holydays the children be duly inſtructed in all pariſhes, in the principles of the Chriſtian Doctrine, and taught obedience both to God and their parents; and if need be, even are to make uſe of eccleſiaſtical cenſures for having this done effectually. Now, as to all preaching, and catechiſing, it is the conſtant practice of that church to do this in the vulgar tongue of each reſpective nation, that ſo the people may receive the benefit of what is ſaid.

'Tis true the common form of adminiſtering the ſacraments in that church is in *Latin*; but then it takes care, that the people be not ignorant of any thing that

that is done in adminiſtration of thoſe myſteries. For this end, the ſaid council of *Trent. Seſſ.* 24. *de Reform. c.* 7. has given ſtrict order to all biſhops, that whether they themſelves, or the pariſh prieſts adminiſter the ſacraments, due care be uſed to expound to the people in the vulgar tongue, according to their capacity, the nature and efficacy of the ſacraments, as it ſhall be found neceſſary, for their approaching to thoſe holy ordinances with greater devotion, and reverence: And this according to the form of the catechiſm *ad Parochos*, which the biſhops ſhall order to be tranſlated into the vulgar languages, and by all pariſh prieſts be expounded to the people. It likewiſe orders, that in time of Maſs, on all holy-days, *&c.* the word of God, and the duties of ſalvation be explained to the people, in the vulgar tongue; and that the pariſh prieſts, avoiding all unprofitable queſtions, be induſtrious to imprint the ſaid duties in the hearts of all, and make them knowing in the law of our Lord. The ſame is ſtrictly enjoined by the ſaid council. *Seſſ.* 5. *c.* 2.

It being thus in terms enjoined by the council of *Trent*, I think, as to this point of order, and diſcipline, we cannot diſagree with this church, or deſire any better rules to be preſcribed for the inſtruction of the flock. But if theſe orders are not in all places ſo duly executed as they ought, yet this, according to our ſecond rule, ought not to be the occaſion of a ſeparate communion.

*Queſt.* II. Whether it be not an inſufferable injury to the people in the church of *Rome* to have the common and daily ſervice of the church (which they call the Maſs) performed in *Latin*, which they do not underſtand? What is this, but to be at prayers like ſo many ſtatues, without ſenſe, or underſtanding?

This is only a matter of diſcipline, and therefore ſubject to alteration, as ſhall be judged convenient for the public good. Hence there may be hopes of peace, as to this; ſince, if we cannot approve it as it is, for peace ſake; the other ſide, upon the motive of a public good, may be prevailed on to allow of a change; as was done in favour of the new

new church in *China*, when leave was granted for the *Miſſal* to be tranſlated, and uſed in the vulgar language of the *Chineſes*; though afterwards it was not found neceſſary to be made uſe of, as it is related by *P. le Comte* in his *Memoirs* of *China*. *Let. to F. la Chaize.* And I have read, that the pope offered the ſame to queen *Elizabeth.*

However, to make way for a right underſtanding in this affair, as to the preſent practice of the church of *Rome.* Though, I muſt confeſs, it looks very ſurprizing to ſee the public ſervice in *Latin:* Yet upon examination, I find this is not particular to the *Latins*, to have the liturgy not in the vulgar tongue. For in this, many other Chriſtian churches do the ſame, which upon the peoples changing their language, keep ſtill their liturgy in the ancient tongue, now ſcarce known to the people: As in the *Greek* church, who have their public ſervice in the ancient, and pure *Greek*, which is ſo very different from the vulgar *Greek* now uſed by the people, that they underſtand but little of it. So amongſt the *Maronites*, *Cophthites*, *Jacobites*, *Melchites*,

and *Georgians*, divine ſervice is celebrated in the *Chaldee*, or *Syriac*; whilſt the vulgar language to all theſe is the *Arabic*, or to the more *Eaſterly*, the *Perſian*. However, while the public ſervice amongſt the *Romaniſts*, is in a tongue not vulgar; yet I find the people are not kept in ignorance of what is done: For the *French* have the whole Miſſal tranſlated into their own language, by which they ſee, and underſtand all that is done at the altar. We have likewiſe ſeveral books in *Engliſh*, which contain the ſervice of that church, and explain all that is performed, with *Latin* in one column, and *Engliſh* in the other, by which the people are enabled to accompany the prieſt, both in ſpirit and underſtanding, and know when to anſwer *Amen*. *Again, upon enquiry, I find the *Maſs* is not a *form of prayer*, like our liturgy, but it is an *action* or *offering*, in which the benefit of the congregation does not ſo much conſiſt, in *underſtanding the words*, as in *knowing what is done*, which the moſt ignorant, and thoſe that cannot read, are capable of, with a little care, and inſtruction;

* The Roman Miſſal has been lately tranſlated into Engliſh. *Ed. Lond.*

tion; for this they are taught by the eye; and hence, if they are but in ſight of the prieſt, they know how to accompany him through the whole ſervice, though they hear not one word of what is ſaid; becauſe *actions* are known by *ſeeing*, as *words* are by *hearing*. This may look ſtrange to ſuch as are accuſtomed to a form of prayer only; but if it be matter of fact, the truth of it may be eaſily found. And if it be ſo found, then there may be hopes of this being no longer made an occaſion of ſeparation; ſince the concern is, of the people ſo underſtanding the ſervice of the church, as to aſſiſt at it with underſtanding and devotion. If this be, then the reaſons of the church of *Rome* will have ſome ſtrength in them, which plead for the Maſs in *Latin*; that ſo, as the church and its faith are one, ſo its worſhip, as much as may be, be one; that it be not ſubject to alteration, as it would be in vulgar languages; that the miniſters of the altar changing reſidence and nation, may ſtill be able to officiate, and ſerve the people; and the faithful leaving their country, or travelling, may ſtill

find the divine ſervice the ſame abroad as at home.

This as to the *Maſs*; for as to *family, and private devotions*, I find it is in the church of *Rome*, the ſame, as with us; all have their prayer-books in their own language, and hence are provided with means for performing all exerciſes of devotion, that can be helpful to ſalvation. Whence this point being ſummed up, That in the church of *Rome*, the people have all their prayer-books in their own language, and even the Maſs too, the difference does not ſeem ſo very great, but by a condeſcendence on one ſide or other (and it is in a yielding matter, to wit, of diſcipline) there may be hopes of an accommodation.

*Queſt.* III. Whether it be not abominable in the church of *Rome* to forbid the uſe of the Bible, and thus to deprive the people of the food of life?

Upon examination, I find the council of *Trent* has given ſtrict orders for eſtabliſhing lectures, and expoſitions of holy writ, *Seſſ.* 5. *c.* 1. in collegiate churches, ſo as to impower the biſhops to compel to it by forfeitures; as likewiſe in all monaſteries,

monaſteries, and colleges, giving encouragement to all maſters, and ſcholars, who ſhall apply themſelves to this ſtudy. And the reaſon it gives for this decree, is, *Ne cæleſtis ille Sacrorum librorum Theſaurus, quem Spiritus Sanctus, ſumma liberalitate, hominibus tradidit, neglectus jaceat.* That ſo that heavenly treaſure of holy ſcripture, with which the Holy Ghoſt, in his infinite bounty, has provided us, may not lie neglected.

Again, I find the ſame council has made a decree, *Seſſ.* 4. *Decr. de Edit. & uſu Sacra lib.* That no body relying on their own private judgment preſume to wreſt the holy ſcriptures, in matters of faith, or manners, to their own private ſenſe, contrary to that ſenſe which the holy church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true ſenſe of ſcripture, or contrary to the unanimous conſent of the holy fathers.

But I no where find in the whole council, that the ſcripture is forbid in the vulgar tongue, nor that there is any danger of reading it. This is only one rule belonging to the *Index Expurgatorius*, bound up with the ſaid council, but

no part of the council, nor ever approved by it, but publiſhed by pope *Pius* IV. and ſeems modeſtly compoſed, in referring this matter to the biſhops and pariſh prieſts, to reſtrain thoſe only from reading the Bible in the vulgar tongue, whom they ſee ſo ſelf conceited, or raſh, as to be in danger of wreſting it to their own deſtruction.

Now as to the rule of interpreting ſcripture here preſcribed according to the ſenſe of the church, and the conſent of the primitive fathers, it is what is approved in our church, and we have reaſon to wiſh, it had been better obſerved. And though we have no ſuch reſtraint as here mentioned, yet while it falls only on the ſelf-conceited and raſh, I hope this will be no occaſion of difference between the churches. And if it be inſiſted on, it is ſoon removed, ſince the communion of that church obliges not to the obſervance of the rule mentioned; as matter of fact demonſtrates in the whole *Gallican* church, which is abundantly provided with ſeveral verſions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, and the liberty of reading it. There is alſo an

Engliſh

Engliſh tranſlation of the holy Bible, made, and printed by the Roman catho-tholics at *Doway* and *Rheims*. Whence it is evident, reading the ſcripture in the vulgar tongue, is allowed in that church, and conſequently, the reſtraint mentioned, can be no ſufficient exception, according to our ſecond rule, againſt communicating with it.

## CHAP. XII.

### *Of Tradition, Miracles, Implicit Faith, and Uncharitableneſs.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER it be not a great cheat, to impoſe tradition upon the world, for the doctrine of Chriſt, and the word of God?

The profeſſion of faith obliges all in communion with the church of *Rome*, to receive traditions; but what traditions are theſe? Only *Apoſtolical*, and *Eccleſiaſtical* traditions; for ſo it is expreſſed in the ſaid profeſſion. And what is meant by theſe, is expounded in the council of *Trent. Seſſ.* 4. *Decr. de Can. Script. viz.* Such doctrines as were delivered by the

apoſtles, without being committed to writing, and being preſerved by the church in all ages, have been delivered down to our days. So that by this article no more is required, but what we already agree to; that is, to receive whatever has been taught by the apoſtles.

Hence in that church is liberty of renouncing all vain, and ſuperſtitious traditions of men; and no ſubmiſſion required, but in ſuch particulars, which have a very full and ſufficient teſtimony of having been received from the apoſtles and pureſt ages of the church. In this principle, I know of no diſagreement. And though there be not that accord, as to what theſe particulars are, yet here are good grounds for an accommodation, while both ſides agree upon receiving whatever is warranted by the practice of the primitive church. Some of ours reckon up ſome of theſe unwritten traditions: as biſhop *Montague* names Infant Baptiſm, and receiving in both kinds; and then adds, There are ſix hundred particulars of this kind, which have been inſtituted by God in the point

of

of religion, commanded, and uſed by the church, of which we own, that the ſcripture delivers, or teaches no ſuch things. *Orig. p.* 396. We have others, who come to more particulars; as the number of canonical books, the apoſtles creed, the faſt of lent, the Lord's-day, the great feſtivals of Eaſter and Whit-Sunday; of not faſting on Sundays, of adoring towards the eaſt, proſtration before the altar, of ſigning the baptized with the croſs, of receiving the euchariſt faſting; theſe are acknowledged to be primitive, and even that it is in the power of the church, to ordain ſuch rites and ceremonies; which, if it can be conceded, will be a means of healing all the breach in this point.

*Queſt.* II. Whether the Romantic legends and counterfeit miracles in the church of *Rome*, are not proof againſt it, of its grand deſign being to deceive; and impoſe upon the world?

This point may be eaſily compounded, eſpecially, ſince the church of *Rome* ſeems to join with the reformation, as to the particulars mentioned. The legends have been corrected long ago by

*Baronius*

*Baronius* and *Ribadeneira*; * and for preventing all fraud, *Veron* in his *Rule of Faith, c.* 2. and *c.* 20. declares the legends to contain ſeveral things prejudicial to truth; and that now being corrected, there may ſtill remain ſomething uncertain or falſe; that they are only of human authority; and therefore no other credit need be given to them, than to other prophane hiſtory. Now while this is declared, the occaſion of deceit ſeems to be taken away, as likewiſe the queſtion, by our ſecond rule, ſince that church impoſes on none the belief of ſuch relations, and there is the ſame liberty of queſtioning them within that communion, as without.

It is much the ſame, as to *miracles*: The church of *Rome* raiſes a jealouſy of them, and provides againſt impoſture, as has been already hinted, *c.* 10. about relics, where the council of *Trent* gives order, that no miracles are to be admitted,

* The learned Jeſuits at Antwerp, Bollandus and his Continuators, have lately given the *Acta Sanctorum*, enriched with curious remarks and diſſertations. And the Rev. Alban Butler has ſtill later written *The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and other principal Saints*, from authentic Records, with Remarks critical and hiſtorical, in 12 Vols. 2d Ed. 1779.

ted, but what are examined, and approved by the biſhop in conſult with divines, and other pious men. Thus ſhe undertakes to reform paſt diſorders, and ſo far joins with us. And as for whatever miracles are approved, yet ſince ſhe impoſes not the belief of them on any of her communion, but leaves them at liberty to examine, and give credit according as they ſee grounds, hence according to our ſecond rule, this point ought not to make a difference between us.

*Queſt.* III. Whether leading people on with an implicit faith, and blindfold, be not unworthy of the Chriſtian profeſſion, and of that rational faculty which God has given us?

That article of our Chriſtian faith, *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church*, ſhews, that we ſhould be always in readineſs to ſubmit ourſelves to the judgment of the catholic church. But otherwiſe, I find not an *Implicit Faith* in any public profeſſion, or in any council. Hence I look upon the common diſpute about it, as a ſchool debate, which, according to our firſt rule, ought not to be made an occaſion of difference. Secondly, I find, that

that it is the rule of that church to admit none into their communion, but ſuch as make an explicit profeſſion of faith, after a due information of every point; except in ſome caſes of neceſſity, when this cannot be done. Thirdly, I find, according to what has been declared, *Chap.* 11. that care is taken by the orders of that church, that all ſhould be well inſtructed in the principles of religion, and piety, and that the catechiſm *ad Parochos*, ſhould be not only tranſlated into the vulgar tongues, but likewiſe conſtantly expounded to the people: Which ſaid catechiſm comprehends all matters both of controverſy, piety, and morality. Now this being in order to an explicit faith, and knowledge of all that belongs to a Chriſtian life, I think there is an agreement in this point; and if any take other methods of ignorance and blindneſs, it is not what that church encourages, and therefore, according to our ſecond rule, ought not to be made the occaſion of any difference.

*Queſt.* IV. Whether the uncharitableneſs of the church of *Rome*, which damns all that are not of her communion, be

not

not enough to abhor the communion of that church?

Upon examination into this point, I find, that in the cloſe of the *Profeſſion of Faith*, which all promoted to dignities in the church of *Rome*, are obliged to make, are theſe words: *Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam nemo Salvus eſſe poteſt, quam profiteor. This true catholic faith, out of which no body can be ſaved, and which I now profeſs.* But ſo it is alſo in the Creed of *Athanaſius*, which we ſay thirteen times a year. Beſides, what are the contents of this profeſſion? In the firſt place, there is the *Nicene Creed* at length, which we too uſe very often; and then are added the Tridentin articles. Now, while the *Whole Creed* is part of this faith, it may very well bear the foreſaid cloſe, *That out of this Faith none can be ſaved.* For this is what we conſent to, though we approve not of the other articles that follow. I know ſome of the *Roman* church carry this ſaying ſo far, as to ſuppoſe all damned, that are out of their church. And yet others in the ſame communion, judge more favourably of ſuch as are invincibly ignorant of theirs being the true church.

This

This I have ſeen in an approved catechiſm. Where the queſtion being put; *What is to be thought of thoſe, who being invincibly ignorant of the true church, live a moral good life?* It is anſwered thus: *We muſt not be forward in condemning ſuch, but leave them to the divine mercy, of which they ſeem not altogether unworthy.* Thus they differ in opinion; and therefore, ſince the uncharitableneſs mentioned in the queſtion, is no where propoſed as a point of faith in the *Roman* church, nor impoſed on ſuch as are admitted to her communion; hence I judge it, not to be of faith, but only of opinion, and conſequently, according to our firſt rule, ought not to make a breach between us.

Eſpecially, ſince no more is meant, but what St. *Paul* declares, that *hereſies* and *ſchiſms* are works of the fleſh, which exclude from the kingdom of Heaven. And is little more than what is declared in our church, particularly by a conſiderable perſon, who has publiſhed this aſſertion, That God has made no covenant of mercy, but to thoſe only, who are in the church: And that, as for thoſe, who are without, we muſt leave them to the uncovenanted mercies of God;

God; which, what they are, or how far they will extend, we know not. *Regal. p.* 223. 1 *Edit.* And what more is it, than we ſay of them in our book of *Homilies*, where in the third part of that againſt idolatry, it is declared, That *biſhops and people, the laity and clergy, of whole Chriſtendom (an horrible and moſt dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices moſt deteſted of God, and moſt damnable to man, and that by the ſpace of eight hundred years, and more.* This comes but little ſhort of what they ſay againſt us. And therefore, when both ſides conſider to what height things have been carried, I hope they will find it more according to charity, to compound the matter, than inflame the difference by ſuch charges as theſe are.

## CHAP. XIII.

*Of leaving out one of the Commandments, of not keeping Faith with Heretics, and of doing Evil, that Good may come of it.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER it be not moſt abominable in the church of *Rome*, to leave

leave out one of the commandments, and thus hide part of the law of God from the people, and this only to conceal its errors?

A ſhort examination ſoon diſcovered to me the occaſion of this queſtion. For, upon peruſing the catechiſms commonly uſed in that church, I found two ſorts; one very ſhort for children; the other longer for youth. The former ſort is ſo ſhort, that none of the commandments, that have any length, are ſet down at length, as the ſecond, third, fourth and fifth. Nay ſometimes all of our ſecond is quite left out, being as they ſay only an explication of the firſt. But in the other ſort of catechiſms, which are alſo in the hands of the people, the ſecond commandment with the reſt is ſet down full and entire: Hence it is plain, the leaving out the ſecond commandment is no order of the church, requiring it to be ſo done; but the two tables of the law are had in that communion, as full as in ours; and conſequently, whatever be the cenſure of the ſhorter catechiſms, yet, according to our ſecond rule, this ought to be no occaſion of difference, ſince that church no

no where impoſes thoſe catechiſms, but gives to all the liberty of the others.

*Queſt.* II. Whether it be not a deteſtable principle in the church of *Rome* not to keep faith with heretics?

Upon due enquiry into this point I find the doctrine of divines in the church of *Rome*, as to this, is the ſame with ours. They all with one voice agree, that all lawful oaths and engagements are to be kept, whatever the perſon be, to whom they are made, without any regard to their religion; and there is nothing allowed by them to make void an oath with any proteſtant, but the ſame would invalidate it likewiſe with thoſe of their own communion. Hear what the Jeſuits themſelves ſay in this matter, *Layman* is thus poſitive: *Dico 4to. Si catholici cum hereticis publicum fœdus ineant, non poteſt per authoritatem pontificam ſolvi, aut relaxari. Theol. mor. l. 2. tr. 3. c. 12.* *Becanus* is ſtill more particular: *Virtutes illæ:* Thoſe virtues, ſays he, from whence ariſes the obligation of being faithful in what we have promiſed, equally oblige us, whether it be with catholics or heretics; becauſe it is never lawful

lawful to lie, never lawful to violate another's right, nor to do any injuſtice, nor to forſwear. *De fid. Hæret. Serv. c.* 7. Thus runs the current of their divines and caſuiſts: 'Whence it muſt be owned, that there is no neceſſity of a ſeparate communion upon this account, ſince the ſame is taught on both ſides. It muſt be likewiſe owned, that they acknowledge no impoſing any doctrine contrary to this, ſince the diſcipline of that church does not allow any to run counter to it; and if it be not impoſed (as matter of fact ſhews it is not) then, according to our ſecond rule, this ought to be made no breach of communion.

*Queſt.* III. Whether it be not a deteſtable principle in the church of *Rome*, to judge any evil lawful, ſo it be for the good of mother church, and not to ſtick at breaking of promiſes and vows, and doing evil, ſo that there be any hopes of good coming of it?

Theſe are certainly moſt deteſtable principles; but upon examination into their councils, profeſſions of faith, catechiſms, divines, *&c.* I can find no ſuch doctrine taught by them. But on leave

the contrary, having looked over their treatiſes of morality, to which this ſubject belongs, I find them delivering the very ſame principles as we do. So that upon the queſtion, of the conditions requiſite for a human action to be good, they poſitively aſſert, That three perfections are required; *viz.* 1. That the object be good. 2. That the motive or end be good. 3. That the circumſtances be good. And that if any of theſe be wanting, the action cannot be good; according to the common maxim, *Bonum ex integra cauſa; malum ex quocunque defectu.* This being their conſtant doctrine, we muſt own no occaſion of difference upon this account.

Now if ſome matters of fact, acted by men of that communion, be conſidered, it is true one might then naturally judge, they have been carried on by ſuch pernicious principles. But the deduction of principles from ſome matters of fact, is too rigid a logic for any church whatever to bear; and being not juſt in itſelf; it is what I think we ought not to preſs; eſpecially ſince the doctrine of

that

that church is otherwiſe evident, and it is no where required by her to approve of ſuch practices, which have given the occaſion of this charge. For thus, according to our ſecond rule, this queſtion ought to be laid by.

And this more eſpecially, when there is evident matter of fact to demonſtrate, they approve not ſuch pernicious principles, but chooſe rather to ſuffer the moſt weighty inconveniences, than act by them. This ſeems evident by what has paſſed here with us. The penal laws againſt the papiſts, have excluded them for above theſe hundred years from many great advantages, which other ſubjects enjoy; and though by taking an *oath*, *teſt*, or *declaration*, or performing ſome outward act of religion, they might be exempt from all ſuch penalties, and qualify themſelves for doing great ſervice both to their families and for the intereſt of their church; yet no proſpect of private or public good, has been enough to make them ſubſcribe any form, or do any religious action, which they judged to be unlawful, and if any

have

have done it, they have at the ſame time left the communion of that church, and thus have given demonſtration, that it is not allowed by them, to break their oaths, nor ſubſcribe forms, which they believe erroneous, nor do evil, for the good of their church, or that any other good may come of it; it being in their power at any time to do what will be for their own intereſt, and their church, if they will but ſeek it by ſuch means, as they judge unlawful. This ſeems to me evidence enough of their principles, and conſequently, that, upon this ſcore, there is no neceſſity of ſeparating communion.

## CHAP. XIV.

### *Of murthering Proteſtants, of the Plots, Treaſons, and Maſſacres by Papiſts.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER it be not a horrid principle in the papiſts, to think it a meritorious act to murther proteſtants?

Murder is certainly horrid; but after all the ſearch I have made, I can find no ſuch

ſuch popery taught in the church of *Rome*. It is in no council, or profeſſion of faith, or catechiſm, it is no where recommended, much leſs impoſed upon any of that communion; and conſequently, though great barbarities have been committed by papiſts; yet that church no where obliges any to partake in, or even approve them, therefore ought not, according to our ſecond rule, be any obſtruction to communion.

I have carefully peruſed their explications of that commandment; *Thou ſhalt not kill:* Eſpecially in the catechiſm *ad Parochos*, which is purpoſely compoſed by that church for the inſtruction of the people, and find there all murder to be as ſtrictly forbid, as we can deſire. There is ſhown how deteſtable a crime it is; how rigorouſly God has prohibited it; that they who murder, do ſtrike at God himſelf, and with violent hands, as it were, make their attempt againſt him; there it is ſtiled *deteſtabile ſcelus, immanis crudelitas, & diabolicus impetus:* deteſtable wickedneſs, a horrid, and barbarous cruelty, and diabolical violence, and nothing omitted, that is capable of imprint-

imprinting a horror of this crime: And this in general, without any regard to religion, but only to the effuſion of human blood: Hence I muſt ſay, that as to this commandment, their doctrine is the ſame with ours, and there ſeems to me no neceſſity of a ſeparate communion on this account.

*Queſt.* II. Whether the barbarous murders, cruelties, and maſſacres committed by the papiſts on proteſtants, be not evidence of their principles in this point?

The very thought of theſe barbarities is horrid, and if I could find, that the communion of that church did oblige to partake in, or approve ſuch practices, I ſhould proteſt againſt all communication with it. But after all my beſt endeavours, I can find nothing, which obliges the members of that church to approve ſuch cruelties; ſo that whatever encouragement they have had, yet this no where is propoſed, and much leſs impoſed on any; but all in that communion are as much at liberty for abhorring murder, and even thoſe very barbarities which have been committed by papiſts, as we are in our church. Hence, with-

out looking farther into theſe ſad hiſtories, according to our ſecond rule, there ſeems no neceſſity of ſeparating on this account: Since a communion with that church, no where obliges to partake in, or approve ſuch cruelties.

*Queſt.* III. Whether ſo many plots, treaſons, rebellions, murders of princes, and infinite other vile attempts managed and carried on by papiſts againſt proteſtants, be not enough to convince any of the principles of their religion, and to give us an abhorrence of all thoughts of communion with them?

There is horror enough in looking back into ſuch bloody annals: But then it is to be conſidered, whether the character of a religion, and the true meaſure of its principles, are to be taken from the practices of ſuch as have been members of it? It is to be conſidered, whether the unwarrantable, and wicked actions of the members of a church, are juſtly charged upon the church, to which they belong?

In reſolving this point, I have recalled to mind the numberleſs treaſons, rebellions, violence, cruelties, and barbarous effuſion

effuſion of blood, ſuch as ſtand recorded in undoubted hiſtory. And having reflected, who have been the perſons engaged in them: As I find no nation in Chriſtendom exempt, ſo likewiſe no ſort, or diviſion of Chriſtians whatever: All have been actors in ſome of them; in many it has been papiſt againſt papiſt; in many, proteſtant againſt proteſtant; in many papiſt againſt proteſtant, and in many proteſtant againſt papiſt. Let the ſeveral changes and revolutions of government, that has been either effected, or attempted in moſt nations, be conſidered; let the treaſons, plots and invaſions, that have been made againſt lawful ſovereigns, be called over. And as all religions are here concerned, ſo I aſk, whether from ſuch unlawful actions, can be taken a true meaſure of the reſpective religions, or of their principles? If it may, then I aſk again, who will fling the firſt ſtone, while all are guilty; and though not alike, yet ſo, as not to be innocent? And if hence cannot be taken a juſt meaſure, then why ſhould it be uſed as a meaſure, when it is none?

The Gun-powder Plot in *Nov.* 1605, is counted an eternal blemiſh to all papiſts. But does not the barbarous murther of King *Charles* I. in 1648, with the renouncing then, and, by act of their parliament, diſinheriting for ever, as they thought, the whole family of the *Stuarts*, as equally affect all proteſtants? They who would know how they firſt tell their own ſtory, may among others, ſee *The Catholique Apology, with a Reply*, &c. By a perſon of honour. The third edition, 1674, and *The Advocate of Chriſtian Liberty*, 1673, and *The Roman Church Vindicated*, &c. London, 1674. From which laſt is taken the following account: The wicked undertakings of a few of that religion, does no more entitle the catholic body to that infamy, than *Poltrot*'s murthering the Duke of *Guiſe*; or *Hubert*'s burning of *London*; or *Beza*'s open Rebellion againſt his lawful King in *France*; or *Knox*'s conſpiracy againſt the Queen Regent, *&c.* do entail that brand upon proteſtant religion: A truth King *James* was ſo well ſatisfied of, that his royal mouth becometh our compurgator againſt that unjuſt imputation,

putation, when, in his declaration againſt that plot, he ſaith, *That the generality of his Catholic ſubjects did abhor ſuch a deteſtable conſpiracy no leſs than himſelf.* Let the miniſter then learn that juſtice of his Majeſty, not to throw his calumnies at random, at the innocent body, as well as guilty particulars; leſt his envious partiality be made a precedent to atheiſtical ſpirits, to ſtile *Judas*'s fact, an *apoſtolical conſpiracy.*

The ſame author goes on: But why a *popiſh plot?* Were not all the engines of policy moſt diligently employed to diſcover the depth of that deteſtable attempt. *Baker, pag.* 565, and 595. And could all their wiſdom find above thirteen *laymen* and four *Jeſuits* (by their own account) of all that either were actors therein, or privy to the ſame? As you may read in *Speed*, (in King *James*'s reign) and *Baker, p.* 593, and their printed *confeſſions.* Not one nobleman, not one of all the peers, nor any other of the catholic gentry, either knowing or approving of that wicked conſpiracy; which perſuaſion is built upon this juſt ground (amongſt others) *viz.* That thoſe

had not tenderneſs enough, to leave any other undiſcovered, whoſe conſcience compelled them to expoſe their own confeſſors to their deſerved penalty: Beſides that *Speed*, *p.* 916, acknowledgeth, that the catholic lords were to have undergone the ſame barbarous fate with the reſt: To which we may add, That *Oſborn*, in his *Mem.* of *K. J. p.* 36, tells us, *That this plot was the treſurer's device.* So he.

Now if any thing be amiſs in the form of prayer, to be uſed yearly upon the *fifth* day of *November*, or in that for the *thirtieth* of *January*, or whatever elſe is added to the *Book of Common Prayer*, foraſmuch as theſe depend wholly upon the royal *mandate*, and not (as the *Common Prayer* itſelf does) upon the *parliament*, the remedy may be the more eaſily procured. For which, ſee what archbiſhop *Laud* ſays, in the *ſpeech* often before mentioned, for his own vindication, againſt the innovations charged upon him: *The ninth innovation is, That two places are changed in the prayers ſet forth for the fifth of* November: *And ordered to be read* (they ſay) *by act of parliament.* To this I ſay

I ſay *firſt*, It is a notorious untruth, that this *book* was *ordered* to be *read* by *act of parliament*. The act of *parliament* indeed is *printed* before it, and therein is a *command* for *prayers* and *thankſgivings* every *fifth of November*; but not one word or ſyllable for the *form of prayer*. That is left to the *church*, therefore here is no *innovation* againſt that *act of parliament*. And afterwards: *His Majeſty*, (ſaith he) expreſsly commanded *me* to make the *alterations*, and ſee them *printed*; which is here noted, becauſe I think it may be of good uſe, if well conſidered.

Thus then, I reaſon the caſe, and find the argument, either to involve all, or elſe come ſhort of all. But laying this aſide, I think the plain truth is this: That people of all religions, when they have either feared oppreſſion, or have been ſolicitous to ſhake off any yoke, or have had their hopes of liberty raiſed by deſigning and ambitious men, have either raſhly engaged, or under the cover of God's cauſe been deluded into unwarrantable actions, without conſidering how they ſquared with common princi-

ples, or at leaſt, finding ſome reaſons to diſpenſe with them, in extraordinary exigencies.

Thus it has been with perſons of all perſuaſions, whence I am inclined to judge, that ſuch violent and wicked undertakings, are not generally to be laid to religion, but to ambition, paſſion, and party; that religion is pretended to ſtrengthen the cauſe; and if religion has been really the occaſion, that principles are then framed to ſerve the turn, but not to be made a rule, or impoſed on all that belong to that communion; and though books have been writ, to juſtify ſuch proceedings, yet ſtill without obliging any to aſſent to ſuch principles. Whether this be the caſe of all, I do not undertake to determine, but it ſeems to be that of the church of *Rome*. For, though many horrid facts have been committed by papiſts, and ſome of them have books to favour them, yet ſtill that church no where requires any to approve either ſuch facts, or the principles, by which they are; but there is the ſame liberty within that church, of diſapproving, and diſſenting from

from all ſuch villanies, as there is for others that are without that pale: Hence, ſince there may be a communicating with that church, without joining in any wickedneſs acted by them; therefore, according to our ſecond rule, this queſtion ought not to make a ſeparate communion.

---

## CHAP. XV.

### *Of Antichriſt, and the Idolatry of* Rome.

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER the Pope be Antichriſt, and the Papiſts idolaters?

Biſhop *Montague* is plain, as to the Antichriſt mentioned in holy ſcripture: I profeſs, ſaith he, ingenuouſly, I am not of opinion, that the *Biſhop of Rome* perſonally, is that *Antichriſt*; nor yet that the biſhops of *Rome* ſucceſſively, are that Antichriſt ſo ſpoken of. *Gag. p.* 74, 75. And ſo alſo to the Informers: Who concluded it, but yourſelves to be flat *popery*, not to believe or preach that the *Pope* is that *Antichriſt?* Or to profeſs the contrary, that he is *not* that

*Antichriſt?* Who can find it to be the doctrine of the church of *England?* And what ſynod reſolved it? Convocation aſſented to it? What parliament, law, proclamation, or edict, did ever command it to be profeſſed, or have impoſed penalty upon repugnants, or non-conſentients unto it? *Ap. p.* 143.

And as to any thing of *idolatry*, or the common charge of *Antichriſt*, Mr. *Thorndike* is poſitive againſt it: They, ſays he, that ſeparate from the church of *Rome*, as idolaters, are thereby ſchiſmatics before God. *Juſt Weights and Meaſures, ch.* 1. And again: Let not them who charge the Pope to be Antichriſt, and the papiſts idolaters, lead the people by the noſe, to believe that they can prove their ſuppoſition when they cannot. *Ch.* 2.

And biſhop *Parker*, ſpeaking of this charge of idolatry, is alſo very plain: So black a crime, ſays he, as this, that is no leſs than renouncing God, is not lightly to be charged upon any party of Chriſtians, not only becauſe of the foulneſs of the calumny, but the barbarous conſequences that may follow upon it,

to

to invite and warrant the rabble, whenever opportunity favours, to deſtroy the *Roman Catholics* and their *images*, as the *Iſraelites* were commanded to deſtroy the *Canaanites* and their idols. But before ſo bloody an indictment be preferred againſt the greateſt part of *Chriſtendom*, the nature of the thing ought to be well underſtood. The charge is too big for a *ſcolding word*. And how inconſiſtent ſoever *idolatry* may be with ſalvation, I fear ſo uncharitable a calumny (if it prove one) can be of no leſs damnable conſequence. It is a piece of inhumanity, that outdoes the ſavageneſs of the *Cannibals* themſelves, and damns at once both body and ſoul. And yet after all, we have no other ground for the bold conceit, than the crude and raſh aſſertions of ſome popular divines, who have no other meaſures of truth or zeal, but hatred to popery; and therefore never ſpare for hard words againſt that church, and run up all objections againſt it into nothing leſs than atheiſm and blaſphemy, of which *idolatry* is the greateſt inſtance. *Reaſ. for Abrog. the Teſt. pag.* 72, 73.

And

And afterwards, more particularly examining this charge as conſiſting of theſe three heads, 1. *The worſhip of images*; 2. *Adoration of the Hoſt*; 3. *Invocation of ſaints*; he has theſe words worthy to be conſidered: But as to the firſt, the uſe of images in the worſhip of God, I cannot but admire at the confidence of theſe men, to make ſo bold a charge againſt them in general, when the images of the cherubim were commanded by God himſelf. *Exod.* 25. 22. They were the moſt ſolemn and ſacred part of the Jewiſh religion; and therefore, though images, ſo far from idolatry, that God made them the *ſeat* of his preſence, and from between them delivered his oracles; ſo that ſomething more is required to make *idolatry*, than the *uſe of images*. This inſtance is ſo plain and obvious to every reader, there being nothing more remarkable in all the Old Teſtament, than the honour done to the cherubim, that it is a much greater wonder to me, that thoſe men who advance the objection of idolatry ſo groundleſly, can ſo ſlightly rid themſelves of ſo pregnant a proof

proof againſt it. *Ib. pag.* 129, 130. And again: Till therefore it be proved that they worſhip images of *falſe Gods* as the *ſupreme Deities*, or that they worſhip the *true God* by *corporeal images* and *repreſentations* of his divine nature, there is no footing for *idolatry* in Chriſtendom. *Ib. p.* 133.

He goes on: As for the adoration of the Hoſt, when they can prove it is given to it either as a *ſymbol* of a *falſe God*, or the *picture* of the *true one*, howſoever faulty it may be otherwiſe, it can be no idolatry. And as for the invocation of ſaints, unleſs they worſhip them as the *Supreme God*, the charge of *Idolatry* is an idle word, and the adoration itſelf that is given to them as ſaints, is a direct *proteſtation againſt Idolatry*, becauſe it ſuppoſes a *ſuperior Deity*, and that ſuppoſition cuts off the very being of *Idolatry*. *ib.* p. 133.

It will be needleſs to cite any other of our writers upon this ſubject, becauſe theſe were eminent perſons in our church: And though this great cry of antichriſtianiſm and idolatry, is ſo often repeated, even in the inſtances above-

mentioned,

mentioned, that I could not but here take notice of it again; yet ſurely, what is now ſaid by theſe learned men, with that before noted to the ſame purpoſe in this eſſay, may by the help of our rules, fairly contribute to a friendly agreement alſo in this point.

---

## CHAP. XVI.

*Of Ceremonies, the Crucifix, and Lights on the Altar, Incenſe, Sign of the Croſs, and Holy Water.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER there be not a number of unprofitable ceremonies in the church of *Roman*, which bring the New Law to the reſemblance of the Old, and obſcure the glory of God?

This point may be eaſily compoſed, while it is in a matter, in which both ſides allow a great latitude. The church of *Rome* allows a great difference of ceremonies within its communion; as is manifeſt in its ſeveral rituals, which are different, according to the antient and immemorial cuſtom of national churches, and even dioceſes. The Eaſtern churches all

all differ in ceremonies from the Weſt, and yet no difference of communion upon this account.

A great latitude is likewiſe allowed by our church, as may be ſeen in what is prefaced to our Common Prayer Book, concerning ceremonies, where having given a reaſon why ſome ceremonies are retained, and ſome laid by, it is thus added: In theſe our doings, we condemn no other nations, nor preſcribe any thing, but to our own people only: For we think it convenient, that every country ſhould uſe ſuch ceremonies, as they ſhall think beſt, to the ſetting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a moſt perfect and godly living, without error or ſuperſtition.

This then is a point, in which both churches ſeem inclined to yield; and therefore, were there but a true deſire of peace, there is likely to be no obſtacle on this account.

*Queſt.* II. What need is there for a crucifix, and lights upon the altar?

Some of our hiſtorians tell us, that queen *Elizabeth* had her altar, with cru-

cifix,

cifix, lights and other adornments, as before uſed in her chapel, till reaſons of ſtate, more than religion removed them. And we now have altars, where may be ſeen in ſacred characters, the ſacred name, *Jehovah*, ſurrounded with a glory. Here are alſo, the two tables of the old law, with *Moſes* and *Aaron*, at their ſides. Yea, we have great candles too, contented with only ſaving ourſelves the trouble and charge of lighting them.

*Queſt.* III. Why is Incenſe now uſed, under the diſpenſation of the new law?

It is to raiſe devotion, to affect prieſt and people with the myſterioufneſs of the action to which it is applied, and to cauſe a pious eſteem of it. Beſides, it ſignifies, that our prayers ought to aſcend as a ſweet perfume in the ſight of God. St. *Dionyſius* mentions it. *Eccl. Hier.* c. 3. And there ſeems nothing more plain, than what the Lord himſelf ſaid, by the mouth of his prophet *Malachy*, foretelling the uſe hereof, in the time of the goſpel: *From the riſing of the ſun, even unto the going down thereof, my name ſhall be great among the Gentiles, and*

*in*

*in every place Incenſe ſhall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering.* Mal. 1. 11.

*Queſt.* IV. Is not the frequent uſe of ſigning with the ſign of the croſs, a great matter of complaint?

In the *Alliance of Divine Offices, c.* 8. *Annot.* we find the uſe of this ſign, at the *healing of the Evil*, in the reigns of king *Edward* VI. and queen *Elizabeth.* And our church ſtill continuing it at *Baptiſm*, without condemning the more frequent uſe of it, as it ſhews there is no iniquity in the thing itſelf, ſo alſo, that the repetition thereof, is not unlawful, but may be good and convenient, according as circumſtances, in the judgment of our ſuperiors, ſhall determine it. I might quote biſhop *Montague* and others, to juſtify the frequent uſe of the ſign of the croſs. But I would here only repeat a little of what the learned Dr. *Falkner*, one of great moderation, has ſaid on this ſubject, in his *Libertas Eccleſiaſtica*, B. 2. C. 4. §. 2. where he begins with telling us in general, that the *ſign of the croſs*, if rightly underſtood, would appear to be of very good and profitable uſe. Then gives ſome account of the practice of the

the primitive church in the uſe of this ſign, for a three-fold end and purpoſe. 1. As a *profeſſing ſign*, whereby they teſtified openly their honouring Chriſt crucified, either before them who denied the Chriſtian name, or among themſelves; or as our *Canon* expreſſeth it, they hereby made an outward ſhew and profeſſion, even to the aſtoniſhment of the *Jews*, that they were not aſhamed to acknowledge him for their Lord and Saviour, who died upon the croſs. 2. This ſign was moſt frequently uſed as an *expreſſion of hope and truſt in Chriſt crucified*, and of confidence in him, expectation of bleſſing from him, and ſupplication unto God by him. 3. The ſign of the croſs was alſo generally made upon the foreheads of them who *were received into the church*. The intent of which ſign in this uſe thereof, was that the church did hereby *ſolemnly teſtify* thoſe perſons having relation to the *Chriſtian ſociety*, to ſtand obliged to *maintain the Chriſtian profeſſion* and life; and ſo far as concerned her authority, did hereby *dedicate or engage* them thereto, and *charge and require* thoſe to be mindful thereof; and

and this was a token to *admoniſh* them, that they muſt not be *aſhamed* to *confeſs* the Chriſtian faith, and to *fight* under Chriſt's banner, and to ſerve and honour him. After which, he treats of this ſign, as uſed in our church, in the office of baptiſm. And in all the inſtances, ſhews a great deal of good reading, for the proof and illuſtration of this ſubject. St. *Auſtin* (as there cited) ſaith in *Pſalm* 141, *Uſque adeo de cruce non erubeſco*, &c. *I am ſo far from being aſhamed of the croſs, that I do not put the croſs of Chriſt in ſome hidden place, but carry it on my forehead.* *Cyril* exhorteth, *Let us not be aſhamed to confeſs him who was crucified; let the* σφραγὶς (the *ſign* of the *croſs*) *be confidently made upon the forehead with the finger.* And the uſe of this ſign, was antiently very common in the actions of life, even in retirement and privacy; as is expreſſed by *Tertullian, de Cor. Mil.* c. 3. *Ad uxor.* l. 2. c. 5. Thus St. *Chryſoſtom, ad Pop. Ant. Hom.* 21. directed the Chriſtian when he went abroad, that he might be in ſafety under the divine protection, *to diſclaim the devil, and expreſs his adhering to Chriſt, with uſing the ſign of the croſs.* When *Julian,*

*Julian*, after his apoſtacy, was afrighted and terrified, while he thought to conſult with the devil, as a remedy againſt his fears, *he ſigned himſelf with the ſign of the croſs* which *Nazianzen*, *Orat.* 3. expreſſeth with words, which ſhew his uſe of that ſign, to be a declaration of *flying for aid, and expecting help from Chriſt, whom he perſecuted* Upon this account this ſign was antiently uſed in the *working miracles*, as is expreſſed by *Nazianzen*, *Epiphanius*, and other fathers, as a viſible teſtimony of confidence in Chriſt. Thus he, with a great deal more, which I have here omitted, becauſe I think that this conſideration of the ſign of the croſs, as being ſo uſeful, a ſhort profeſſion of faith, a prayer, and declaration of our truſt in Chriſt, for great bleſſings, and againſt great evils, is enough to allay all heats about the ſuperſtitious uſes thereof, and to cauſe ſuch a good underſtanding between all concerned herein, that there may be no breach of communion, upon this ſcore.

*Queſt.* V. Can any people of ſenſe, endure to hear of holy water, and ſtand ſtill

ſtill without horror, to have it thrown on their faces?

Having had the concurrence of ſo many, in the points above mentioned, I did not think any one would ſtartle at a daſh of holy water. There is an early mention of holy water, with approbation, in *Numb.* 5. 17. This rite, now uſed, was aptly figured by the waters of expiation, which did ſanctify and cleanſe the polluted, *Numb.* 19. 18. It is encouraged by king *David*: *Aſperges me Hyſſopo*, &c. *Thou ſhalt ſprinkle me with Hyſſop, and I ſhall be clean; Thou ſhalt waſh me, and I ſhall be whiter than ſnow.* Pſalm 50, or 51. 7. And St. *Paul* warrants it: *Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refuſed, if it be received with thankſgiving. For it is ſanctified by the word of God, and prayer*, 1 Tim. 4. 4, 5. Where what the apoſtle ſpeaks of the benediction of meats, may be well applied to any thing that may be ſanctified, offered, and conſecrated to God. St. *Clement* tells us that this holy water, is an apoſtolical conſtitution. He ſays that St. *Matthew* did inſtitute the uſe of it, and he relates the manner of his bleſſing it.

it. *Conſt. Apoſt.* l. 8. c. 39. Pope *Alexander* I. the ſixth pope from St. *Peter*, made a decree about it, but ſuch as ſuppoſed the uſe of it before. *Aquam ſale conſperſam populis benedicimus*, &c. *We bleſs for the people, water with ſalt, that all who are ſprinkled therewith, may be ſanctified and purified; and which we command all prieſts to do.* So it was not then his invention, but a cuſtom. And his reaſons for the uſe of it, are theſe: *If the aſhes of an heifer, being ſprinkled with blood, did ſanctify and cleanſe the people, much more, water ſprinkled with ſalt, and ſanctified by divine prayers. And if the ſterility of the waters were healed by the prophet* Eliſha, *with ſalt ſprinkled therein, by how much more, being ſanctified by divine prayer, may it take away the ſterility of human things, and avert the ſnares of the devil, and defend men from phantaſtic wiles, and hallow thoſe that are defiled.* And again: *If we doubt not but that the ſick were healed by the touch of our Saviour's garments, how much more, by virtue of his words, may the elements, divinely hallowed, bring health of body.* St. *Baſil* the Great, reckons it among the apoſtolical traditions. *Lib. de Sp. S. C.* 27.

And

And ſo alſo for the effects of it, St. *Epiphanius* ſhews, that *Joſeph*, a convert Jew, did diſſolve incantations by it. *Hær.* 30. And St. *Hierome* doth teſtify the ſame of St. *Hilarion*. *Hier. in Vit. Hilar.* Beſides, St. *Bernard* witneſſeth, that St. *Malachias* therewith, cured a frantic man, and a woman that had a grievous cancer. *Bern. in Vit. Malac.* This ſhews the uſe antient and profitable. And it is certain that the holy fathers at leaſt believed it to be good, both for body and ſoul.

In our church, there is enough to abate our prejudices againſt the hallowing, that is, the ſanctifying of waters, in thoſe words of our public office for baptiſm: Almighty and everlaſting God, who by the baptiſm of thy well-beloved ſon Jeſus Chriſt in the river *Jordan*, didſt *ſanctify water*, to the myſtical waſhing away of ſin. And in the liturgy for *Scotland*, it is added: *Sanctify this fountain* of baptiſm, thou which art the *ſanctifier* of *all things*. Biſhop *Andrews*, in his *ſtrictures* upon the two miracles of *Joſeph* the convert *Jew*, in *Epiphanius*, and *Marcellus*, the biſhop of *Apamea*, in *Theodoret*,

*Theodoret*, produced by cardinal *Perron*, on this ſubject, does not deny them, but only ſays, that if they were ſo done, it was rather by virtue of the faith in Chriſt, than of the *water* or *ſign*; known many times ſince, to have had no ſuch effect. Adding, that two miracles, without any canon to enjoin it, will not conclude any rule for the practice of it, in the church. *Strict.* p. 13. Now ſince this faith is equally an ingredient in all ſuch miracles, ſo that our Saviour himſelf, could do nothing among ſome people, becauſe of their unbelief: And every body knows, that the moſt powerful antidote, has not always the ſame effect: Since, if theſe two miracles be allowed, there are many more will be brought upon the ſame authority, and one of theſe alone, is ſufficient: Since, whether there be a canon, or no canon for it, it may be a cuſtom and practice in the church, and that too, for good purpoſes, to remind us of our baptiſm, and to fortify us againſt the illuſions of evil ſpirits: Yea, ſince our biſhop here, ſhews but little or no diſlike thereof, what does he herein, but *diſpoſe* us to believe

believe it of good uſe? Which I am the more inclined to think he intended, becauſe here, but a little before, *p.* 11. on ſuch another occaſion, he does as faintly oppoſe the cardinal, about *mingling of wine with water in the Euchariſt.* When as it is obſerved, in his own *form* of conſecrating a church or chapel, that then, in the celebration of this ſacrament, when left to his own reaſoning, he uſed this mingling himſelf. Why not then the hallowed water? The devil indeed abhors it, becauſe he has found the power and virtue of it, to his own confuſion. Which we all muſt own, having declared it to the whole world, in that our national proverb, where in reference to one that greatly heats any thing, it is uſually ſaid, *He loves it, as the devil loves holy water.* So that after all, unleſs we would take an ill example, it is hoped, that that even this point, as the reſt, according to our rules, may be no longer a cauſe of diſunion.

## CHAP. XVII.

### *Of the great Averſeneſs in the Romaniſts, againſt the Engliſh Miniſtry.*

*Queſt.* I. WHETHER there may not upon a fair propoſal, be a full agreement about the miniſtry of our church?

This is a matter of very great concern, and ſuch differences there are upon this account, as between our church and the Diſſenters, ſo between the Romaniſts and us, that unleſs there be an accommodation here, it will be vain to hope for Catholic communion.

In a late *eſſay towards a comprehenſion*, there is a *propoſal* offered, in behalf of the preſent Diſſenting miniſters, to this effect: That, without any new ordination to *prieſthood*, they ſhall be by laying on of the hands of the biſhop only, and by the delivery of the *bible* unto them, (I ſuppoſe upon their knees) particularly authorized to execute that office in that particular congregation, to which they are lawfully appointed, in thoſe words of

of our ordinal, *Take thou authority to preach the word*, &c.

Then follow the *arguings* on both ſides: The church-men plead, that the ordination of the Diſſenters is done in a ſchiſm, and without any lawful authority, in oppoſition to the eſtabliſhed order of the national church; and that it is done without the conſent and concurrence of the biſhop, who in the *Engliſh* church has the chief juriſdiction in the eccleſiaſtical affairs, without whoſe concurrence therefore, the ordination received from the hands of the Diſſenters, as null in itſelf, and contrary to the eſtabliſhed order and government of the church of *England*, ought to be reiterated and renewed.

The Diſſenters on the other hand, plead, That ſuppoſing they were ordained in a ſchiſm, yet their ordination is valid and good, being done by the Preſbytery, or thoſe who execute the office of Preſbyters, in that way which is required by the ſcriptures, *viz.* By faſting, prayer, and impoſition of hands. That therefore, there is the ſame reaſon for the re-baptizing of thoſe, who are not

baptized by thoſe of the church of *England*, which yet they do not allow of, as there is for re-ordaining thoſe who are not ordained by the church-men. They argue farther, That many of the reformed churches abroad, ordain their miniſters by the ſame church officers, as the Diſſenters do in *England*; and that therefore, if the ordination of Diſſenters here in *England* be null, theirs alſo muſt be null; and by conſequence they can have no ordinances, and are no churches, as having no miniſters, who are an integral part of the viſible church. That therefore though (if the conſequence of the action reached no farther than themſelves) they might for peace ſake ſubmit to be re-ordained; yet they can never be induced to do that which is, in effect, to unchurch ſo great a part of the reformation, and which muſt, of neceſſity, put a weapon into the hands of the Papiſts againſt them; for which reaſons, though they would do what lies in them for the promoting the peace and welfare of our *Engliſh Iſrael*, they cannot ſubmit to be re-ordained.

But

But then withal, it is to be conſidered, that there are alſo as great debates between us and the *Romaniſts*, upon this point. For though I cannot willingly believe but that our orders are good: Becauſe in the 36th article of religion, our church does tell us, that the ordinal, or book of conſecration and ordering, ſet forth in the time of King *Edward* VI. and at the ſame time confirmed by authority of parliament, doth contain all things neceſſary to ſuch conſecration and ordering; without any thing of itſelf ſuperſtitious, and ungodly. And therefore, they decree all ſuch as are conſecrated or ordered according to the ſame rites, to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully conſecrated and ordered. And there was a diſpenſation in behalf of King *Edward*'s clergy, granted by Cardinal *Pole*, and confirmed by the Pope, in the reign of Queen *Mary*. And under Queen *Elizabeth*, there was beſides patents, an act of parliament, 8 *Elizabeth*, to put an end to the diſputes about her clergy. And the ordinal was made better under King *Charles* II. And we have neceſſity to plead for us. And our

orders have, with great ſhew of reaſon, been vindicated by Mr. *Maſon*, Archbiſhop *Bramhall*, Biſhop *Fern*, Biſhop *Burnet*, Dr. *Saywell*, Dr. *Fuller*, Mr. *Brown*, and others, in great numbers. Yea, our orders, have been ſometimes owned, even by ſome of the *Roman* communion. Yet, on the other part, it is likewiſe urged with great earneſtneſs, that in the firſt parliament of Queen *Mary*, all conſecrations which had been made according to the ordinal of *Edward* the ſixth, were declared to be null and void. Which is taken notice of by Dr. *Heylin*, in his *Hiſtory of the Reformation*. And ſoon after, the Biſhops procured from the Queen an *Injunction* to all the ordinaries in the realm, to execute certain articles, wherein it was declared, that ſuch perſons as had been promoted to any orders after the new ſort and faſhion of orders, were not ordained *in very deed*. Which Mr. *Fox* mentions in his *Act. and Mon. Par.* 2. and thereupon in the *Index* makes this note: *Miniſters revolting to Popery, muſt with their new religion have new orders*. And it is further ſaid, that whatever the diſpenſation was, it was

the

the Papal power, and we are to thank the Pope and Cardinal for it; that it ſuppoſes a great defect in that clergy, but extended only to ſuch, as had been ordained after the antient and catholic manner, in the time of ſchiſm, as appears even by the degradations of *Ridley*, and *Hooper*, only from their prieſthood, and not from epiſcopacy, becauſe not allowed to be Biſhops; and in that, as for Mr. *Bradford*, made prieſt by the new form, they did not degrade him at all, but treated him as a meer Laic; the orders conferred by the new ordinal, being then rejected as not good. And they were made worſe under Queen *Elizabeth*, if the ſtory of the Nag's-Head, or what the Reverend Mr. *St.* has wrote about the Conſecrators then, be true. Farther demonſtrated by Biſhop *Bonner*'s plea; ſo that there was no help, but by the act of parliament, 8 *Elizabeth*, which yet as the patents, is thought to make the caſe worſe. And worſe ſtill, if the report alſo of the non-baptiſm of the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, or of his latitudinarian principle, may paſs. Beſides that they ſay, the emendation of

the ordinal came too late. And they will not allow of any neceſſity to be pleaded for us. And it is matter of fact, that our orders are not allowed by the church of *Rome*, but though they hold re-ordination to be a ſacrilege, they own not our miniſters that go over to them, to be prieſts, till they be ordained by them, as if never ordained before. And there are ſeveral books they have written too againſt our orders; ſuch are, *Proteſtants demonſtrations againſt Proteſtant miniſters.* And, *The treatiſe with reflection upon the nullity of the Engliſh Proteſtants church and clergy.* And, *The nullity of the prelatique clergy, and church of* England. Both the *Eraſtus's*, The *Relation of the Engliſh Reformation*, and ſeveral others, before and ſince them, too many to be here ſet down. And as for thoſe few of that communion, that have at any time ſpoke favourably of our orders, we are told, that their charity was miſtaken therein, and they were under the diſpleaſure of their church, or ſhrewdly ſuſpected.

It is here alſo to be noted, that Mr. *St.* abovementioned, who is eminent for

for his zeal in religion, has, notwithſtanding his orders, thought fit, to inſiſt upon an extraordinary *call* to the miniſtry: Though indeed, I do not hear of any miracle he has yet done, to aſcertain it; and an uncertain call, as an uncertain clergy, and an uncertain church, can give no comfortable aſſurance to us.

This certainly is to be well conſidered. The more, becauſe the famous Mr. *Dodwell*, whom we ought to honour for his learning, is very poſitive, that where they want epiſcopal ordination, they have no miniſtry, no ſacrament, no church, are out of the covenant of grace, and hope of ſalvation.

What then is to be done here on our ſide? What to make us all eaſy in this point? Methinks by our own rules, there may be ſome expedient, and a good accommodation, if we would take care, not to let ignorance, prejudice and paſſion, blind us, or hinder any good deſign; not to be tied up to any faction, but to embrace truth wherever we meet it. Unity among proteſtants only, if it were poſſible to be had, would not ſerve the ends of our holy religion. We

ſhould all of us endeavour a more catholic union, that there may be an univerſal peace, over the whole Chriſtian world. It is therefore here, with the greateſt ſubmiſſion to ſuperiors, and others, moſt humbly aſked, why upon our agreement in the other inſtances, there may not, without leſſening the honour of our church, or making any unbecoming condeſcenſions, be a modeſt, Chriſtian addreſs to his Holineſs, who is generally looked upon, as the common Father of Chriſtendom: whom King *James* I. owned Patriarch of the Weſt, and his church our mother church; whom our writers, Biſhops and others, often mention, as they do Cardinal *Pole* too, with reſpect at leaſt on this occaſion, for the kindneſs we think done us, by the diſpenſation, that was granted to King *Edward*'s clergy, from whence the ſucceſſion of our preſent miniſtry is derived: to conſider now our plea, and to allow, if it may be done, our preſent orders, or to ordain us only conditionally as it is uſual to baptize conditionally in the caſe of a doubtful, or much ſuſpected baptiſm. By this all intereſts may be

ſerved.

ſerved. Our Biſhops and the whole clergy, may be ſecured of their places, profits, and honours, and may alſo, without ſcruple, exerciſe all their miniſterial functions. And then the laity too may be all at eaſe: they may ſafely diſburthen themſelves, truſt their ſouls with their ſpiritual guides, and receive their benedictions with comfort.

## CHAP. XVIII.

### *The Concluſion.*

I Should remind thoſe concerned herein, that not only the word *maſs*, as obſerved before, but *prieſts* and *altars*, with their uſual *veſtures* and *ornaments*, *ſacrifice*, *paten* and *corporas*, *chalice* with *wine* and *water*, *communion* in *one kind* in caſe of neceſſity, *bread* made in the form of a *wafer*, and after conſecration taken at the prieſt's hands, by the people, in their *mouths*, *reſervation* of the ſacrament, triple *merſions*, *chryſoms*, and *oils*, commemoration of the glorious and moſt bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, *holy patriarchs*, *prophets*, *apoſtles*

*apoſtles* and *martyrs*, invocation of *angels*, ſo far as to beſeech God to command our *prayers* and *ſupplications*, by their *miniſtry*, to be brought up into his *holy tabernacle*, before the ſight of his *Divine Majeſty*, *prayers for the dead*, *extreme unction*, *croſſings*, and other things now in diſpute, were retained in the *firſt liturgy* of king *Edward* VI. A liturgy, which the *ſtatute* that enacted it, 2 and 3 *Ed.* 6. c. 1. ſays, was made by *the archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *and certain of the moſt learned and diſcreet biſhops, and other learned men of this realm, having as well eye and reſpect to the moſt ſincere, and pure Chriſtian religion taught in the ſcripture, as to the primitive church.* And which the ſame *ſtatute* ſays alſo, was *by the aid of the Holy Ghoſt, with one agreement, concluded, ſet forth, and delivered to his majeſty, to his great comfort and quietneſs of mind.* A liturgy, which this king *Edward* himſelf recommended in his *meſſage*, written the 8th of *July*, in the third year of his reign, to the rebels of *Cornwall* and *Devonſhire*, then diſguſted at it, in theſe words: For the *maſs*, (ſo it is *here* called as in the *book* itſelf, and alſo in the *ſtatute* that enforced it, and in the

the king's *injunctions*) *We aſſure you, no ſmall ſtudy and travel hath been ſpent by all the learned clergy therein, and to avoid all contention thereof, it is brought even to the very uſe as* Chriſt *left it, as the* apoſtles *uſed it, as* holy fathers *delivered it: indeed altered from that which the popes of* Rome *for their lucre brought to it.* A liturgy, which the *ſtatute*, 3 and 4 *Ed.* 6. *c.* 10. repreſents as a *godly order, agreeable to the order of the primitive church, therein being nothing to be read, but the very pure word of God, or what is evidently grounded upon the ſame.* And which, even the *ſtatute*, that made it give way to another, 5 and 6 *Edward* 6. *c.* 1. could not forbear ſaying, that it was *a very godly order, agreeable to the word of God, and the primitive church, very comfortable to all good people, deſiring to live in Chriſtian converſation, and moſt profitable to the eſtate of this realm.* Soon after alſo, ſaying, *That the doubts riſen in the uſe and exerciſe of it, were rather by the curioſity of the miniſters and miſtakers, than of any other worldly cauſe.* A liturgy, the more eſteemed, becauſe ſome of its *compilers*, before admired for their learning and diſcretion, have had the honour too,

too, to be reckoned among our *martyrs*. A liturgy, which archbiſhop *Bancroft*, of *Canterbury*, ſpeaking thereof in his ſermon preached at St. *Paul's Croſs*, 1588, affirmed to have been publiſhed firſt, *with ſuch approbation, as that it was accounted the work of God.* A liturgy, which many have wiſhed to be reſtored; but none more paſſionately than Mr. *St.* who in favour thereof, has expoſed the other, for a *deformed, diſordered*, Cranmerian *changeling*; and not ſpared to charge our church, with *ſacrilege*, *hereſy* and *ſchiſm*. God forbid we ſhould give any occaſion for this! But hence we may take hope, that upon reflection hereon, ſince this liturgy is ſo greatly deſired; is cleared from what the popes of *Rome* had for lucre brought to it; has been declared the work of God, concluded by the aid of the Holy Ghoſt, *&c.*; the ſeveral inſtances above noted therein, and indeed, all the points more largely diſcourſed on in this eſſay, may at length be fairly agreed on. And which ſeems now, the ſooner to be expected, becauſe a great prelate, in his late printed ſpeech, has already thought fit, in ſome meaſure, to prepare

prepare the world for it, by telling it ſo publicly, that there is a propoſal made by one who calls himſelf a *High Churchman*, that a treaty may be ſet on foot between our convocation, and the aſſembly of the clergy of *France*, and that we ſhould abate the regal ſupremacy, and they the papal, then fancying all other matters would be eaſily adjuſted.

The learned propoſer can anſwer for himſelf. What I deſire leave to ſay, is this: That having gone through the principal points of controverſy, that have kept open the breach between the two churches ever ſince the firſt diviſion, and compared them with our rules of peace, which all churches ſeem under a neceſſity of approving; I cannot find, but the far greater part of them ought to be laid aſide: and as for the reſt, they are ſo few, that as I cannot but think it an unhappineſs that churches ſhould be divided upon this account; ſo I cannot but hope, if ſome learned, and zealous lovers of peace, were commiſſioned on both ſides, by thoſe in power, to enquire into this matter, they might find means to compound our differences therein,

therein, and take away the great ſcandal of Chriſtendom, occaſioned by our diviſions.

But however, while I have made uſe of theſe rules, offered to our Diſſenters, I do not pretend, that the caſe of our church, in reſpect to the church of *Rome*, is the ſame with that of our Diſſenters, in reſpect of the church of *England*; but I only plead ſo far, that ſince theſe are rules proper for extinguiſhing thoſe unnatural heats, and animoſities, which have long been the reproach of Chriſtians, they may ſo far be made uſe of here, as they may contribute to this end: hoping, that charity will accept of them, in order to leſſen our diſputes, without making compariſon, whether they preſs in all caſes alike.

One caſe is too plain, that there are great ſchiſms amongſt Chriſtians, to the ſcandal of their profeſſion, and to the injury of all religion, and that wherever the fault be, it is not only that part ſuffers, but likewiſe all the reſt; ſince the miſchiefs, and ſcandals of ſchiſms, ſpread far beyond the guilt. Hence, I think, it ought to be a common

mon concern, to ſee if there be any expedients of peace, and to try, how far they will go, not only for healing the breach on one ſide, but on all; that ſo, greater may be the glory of peace.

This is what I have attempted, and it being only by way of an eſſay, I hope miſtakes in it will be the more pardonable; ſince I aſſert nothing, but only offer what I have done, as a propoſal to thoſe whoſe leiſure and charity, will encourage them to make a more ſtrict ſcrutiny in theſe particulars. Into the hands of thoſe I recommend theſe few ſheets; making it my earneſt requeſt to them, to promote this deſign, as far as it is found ſerviceable to peace and truth; and charitably to inform me of my miſtake, if by over-ſight in ſuch variety of matter, I have ſaid any thing that may do ſervice to error.

For, I declare (if I know my own heart) there is not any one error in the world, which I deſire ſhould be benefited by my writing. I deſire peace, it is true, and the communion of our church to be extended, but not at the price of error. Though I cannot but fear,

fear, ſome will take offence at what I have done, and arraign me of this very thing, even of making way for error, becauſe I ſeem to ſpeak in favour of popery, and leſſen the horror of its errors. But I hope theſe will give the cauſe a rehearſing, or examine it again, before they pronounce ſo ſeverely upon me.

If they will do thus, I hope, they will find, that my buſineſs all along is to examine, what are the errors of popery, and which are the points, in which we cannot join. I have conſidered all its idolatry, ſuperſtition, cruelties, barbarities, maſſacres, &c. And I do declare from my heart, that theſe are moſt hateful both to God and man, and that there is no joining with theſe, but by renouncing both Chriſtianity and reaſon. Who can deſire more?

Well, but I have gone farther, and aſſerted, that the church of *Rome* does not require any to aſſent to theſe abominations, and thus have leſſened the deformity of popery. It is true, I have examined, what are the terms upon which the church of *Rome* offers communion; I have conſidered what it demands, what

what it impoſes, what are the articles to which it exacts a ſubmiſſion. But then, I deſire it may be conſidered, this was the very thing I undertook; for my buſineſs was to ſee, if there was a poſſibility of enlarging the communion of our church. This could not be done, but by enquiring, What was the communion of that moſt conſiderable diviſion from us, which makes up the church of *Rome*, and ſeeing what ſhe impoſes on her members. This enquiry then I made, and accordingly I have made a report of what I found; ſetting down thoſe particulars, to which ſhe demands aſſent: And where ſhe demands none, I have likewiſe declared it according to truth. This then was neceſſary, ſince no peace can be made, but by examining the terms propoſed by thoſe, with whom we are at difference.

Here then it was, that carried by the deſire of an univerſal peace, and of that catholic communion, which was the glory of the primitive church of Chriſt: I enquired of the church of *Rome*, what were the conditions of peace with her.

I enquired,

I enquired, Whether ſhe demands an aſſent to, or an approbation of thoſe many plots, treaſons, murthers, cruelties, barbarities, &c. that have been carried on by papiſts, to the effuſion of ſo much Chriſtian blood? And I found that ſhe demands no ſuch aſſent, or approbation; but that thoſe that are in her communion, may as freely and heartily deteſt them, as in any other communion whatever. Now this owns the facts to be of papiſts, and to be unchriſtian; but it owns too, that it is no part of their religion to approve them. And if this be true, why ſhould it not be owned? For my part, I confeſs, it is a comfort to me to find it ſo; ſince there is ſo much of difference removed out of the way, and ſo much more hopes of peace. Thoſe that are charmed with the deformity of ſchiſm amongſt Chriſtians, may ſhew a zeal in widening the breach: but to me, I own, it looks ſo ſcandalous, that I am glad to find it leſſened.

I enquired, Whether ſhe demands an aſſent to the depoſing and king-killing doctrine? And I found no ſuch thing required; but that whatever has been writ,

or

or done by any of that church, yet that her communion is open to ſuch as oppoſe all ſuch principles: And that any one may as heartily diſown them in that church, as out of it. I was glad to find this too, ſince in this, there is ſo much occaſion of ſchiſm, taken out of the way: And there may be communion with that church, without approving ſuch doctrines.

I enquired, Whether ſhe demands an aſſent to thoſe many abuſes, corruptions, ſuperſtitions, which had crept in, to the ſcandal of believers, and gave an occaſion to the firſt thoughts of a reformation? And I found a great part of theſe confeſſed by her, to be abuſes; that ſhe is ſo far from demanding an aſſent, that ſhe joins with the reformation in condemning them, and in the council of *Trent*, gives order for their amendment. I was glad to find this too, ſince this is ſo far a preparation for peace, whilſt the communion with that church, requires the condemnation of the great part of thoſe corruptions, which the reformation condemns.

I en-

I enquired, Whether ſhe demands an aſſent to the various opinions of ſchoolmen, to the looſe opinions of the caſuiſts, to the vices, ambition, and covetouſneſs, of the churchmen, or of the Roman court? And I found that no aſſent was required to any of theſe; but that within her communion, there was the ſame liberty of diſſenting from all theſe, as without her pale. I was glad to find this too, becauſe here are ſo many ſtumbling-blocks removed out of the way; and none of theſe things are a hinderance to communion.

I enquired, Whether in the church of *Rome*, there was not pardon of ſins for money; pardon for unſaken ſins; whether ignorance was not encouraged, and a liberty of breaking all oaths? And I found, notwithſtanding many abuſes, that in the church of *Rome*, is taught the ſame, as to all theſe points, which we teach in the church of *England*; and that communicating with the church of *Rome*, does not oblige us to quit any thing of what we now believe, and hold as to theſe particulars.

I en-

I enquired, Whether communion with the church of *Rome*, obliged any to forſake God, or Chriſt Jeſus, or his goſpel, or the commandments? And I found the ſame creed, the ſame commandments, and the ſame goſpel profeſſed, and taught in the church of *Rome*, as with us. That in the church of *Rome*, they are taught to love God above all things, to ſeek him before all things, to put their whole truſt in God, to believe in Chriſt, their only Redeemer and Mediator; through whoſe merits, all things are to be obtained of God, and without whom, nothing can be obtained. That, notwithſtanding all former prohibitions, the word of God is freely read by the people, in her communion; and that by communicating with her, there is no neceſſity of changing any thing of what we now believe and practiſe, as to theſe particulars.

I enquired, Whether national churches in communion with *Rome*, muſt be ſtript of all the antient liberties, and privileges belonging to them; and whether princes in the ſame communion, muſt of conſequence ſurrender themſelves to the beck of the Pope, to be trampled

trampled on according to his pleaſure? And I found, that in the Roman communion, both national churches and ſtates, may take the ſame liberty of maintaining their authority, privileges, and immunities, and ſtand as reſolutely againſt all papal uſurpations, as if they owned no prerogative of power in that ſee.

I enquired at length into thoſe points, in which the two churches differ; and having ſtrictly examined what the church of *Rome* teaches in theſe particulars, and having ſeparated her doctrine from all ſchool-opinions, and practical abuſes, I found the difference in ſome points, to be little more than in *terms*, and that by eminent and leading men in our own church, is approved, and taught the very ſame, in ſubſtance, at leaſt, which is taught by the church of *Rome*.

This, I own, was a ſatisfaction to me; for the ſentiments of ſuch great men, I hoped, might be a means of compounding theſe points, and taking away the ſcandal of diviſion, that is between us. Not that I go ſo far, as to impoſe the particular ſentiments of ſuch our prelates

lates or doctors, upon our church, as if it were her general and approved doctrine; for I know it is not. But my hopes were thus raiſed, that there might be ſome favourable opinion of ſuch doctrines, ſince they were maintained and taught as primitive truths, by paſtors and prelates of our own church, being men of ſuch a character, that their piety and learning, and their particular induſtry in enquiring into the primitive church, challenge a veneration from all; or at leaſt, that ſeeing ſuch doctrines aſſerted by prelates of our own church, we might conſider, whether it be reaſonable to ſeparate from a church for holding and teaching ſuch doctrines, which at the ſame time are publicly taught by our own paſtors, and tolerated in them without cenſure? Here, I confeſs, was my encouragement. For ſince all ſchiſm in the ſenſe of the primitive church, is declared ſo damnable, and all Chriſtianity ſuffers from the miſchiefs of it, I could not but hope, that whatever is tolerable, would be judged fit to be tolerated, upon ſo preſſing a motive, as that is, of removing diviſion, and re-

eſtabliſhing catholic communion in the Chriſtian world. Which communion, I cannot but think, might be effected at leaſt, between theſe two churches, by proceeding upon this foot alone, of conſidering what is tolerated on either ſide: For by what I obſerve, ſo much is tolerated on both ſides, that there would be found very little difference between the churches, if they were to be brought as near together, as theſe mutual condeſcenſions would give them leave. For it is not in the Gallican church only popery is taught with this moderation, as has been ſtated in this eſſay, but throughout the whole extent of that church, communion is offered upon the ſame terms, that is, it is no where exacted of any (not even in *Rome* itſelf, under the Pope's noſe) to aſſent to the exceſs of the Pope's ſupremacy, nor to his infallibility, nor to his depoſing power, *&c.* as may be ſeen in Pope *Pius*'s bull, and profeſſion, to which whoever ſubſcribes, as there ordered, is qualified for any church preferment, and yet in this there is not one word of theſe doctrines. So that whether in *France*, or out of *France*, theſe are no terms of communion,

nion, nor is any aſſent either aſked or required to them.

Having thus found things, I have publiſhed them as I found them; and if it gives offence to any at firſt ſight; yet, I hope, upon better conſideration, it will prove to the ſatisfaction of all, who have a true ſenſe of religion, or any compaſſion for the unhappy ſtate of Chriſtendom. All theſe muſt be ſenſible that *diviſions* are the misfortune of the church, and the viſible marks of God's juſt indignation againſt us; whilſt vice, and errors, atheiſm, and irreligion make ſuch advantage of them: and conſequently, muſt be ſatisfied, as in the proſpect of a public good, to find any overtures made for removing the great differences, that have been ſo long between us, and that moſt conſiderable body of Chriſtians in communion with the Roman ſee.

If there could be no ſuch peace propoſed, but by approving, or uniting with thoſe corruptions and impieties, found in that communion, the propoſal would then be no ſervice to Chriſtianity, and war would be much better than peace. But ſince, upon making enquiry, it appears, that all ſuch impieties may be,

and are, as fully renounced by members of that church, as by ours: ſince many others are no more than ſchool opinions, or corrupt practices, which none in that communion are bound to approve: ſince the points in differences, are only ſpeculative doctrines, and many of theſe even favoured by learned men of our own ſide: Muſt not this be a ſatisfaction to find, that in that great diviſion of Chriſtians, which has been kept up ſo many years between the church of *England*, and the church of *Rome*, with ſo much of unchriſtian heats, there ſeem to be but very few points, which keep open the breach: That above three parts of thoſe debates may be laid aſide, which have hitherto ſerved to exaſperate, and alienate our minds from all thoughts of peace: That the church of *Rome* does not inſiſt upon thoſe hard terms, which have been judged inconſiſtent with common Chriſtianity, but leaves all to the liberty of renouncing them: That there is no need of joining in any one of thoſe notorious abominations fixed upon her, for joining in her communion.

Since this, I ſay, appears, muſt not this be a comfort to all lovers of peace,

to ſee, that where there has been the greateſt diviſion, the ſtrangeſt animoſities, the moſt diſedifying heats; there now appear ſo many differences removed, and ſo great a preparation for accommodating whatever debates are yet left between them? I own it again, it is a comfort to me, and I ſhould be heartily glad to ſee this reconciling method ſo far purſued by men of power, and zeal, till there appear thoſe moſt deſirable effects of catholic communion, and an univerſal peace.

To give encouragement to this great work, and ſhew theſe notions to be better built, than on my private reaſoning, I muſt here declare, that, though it has been my labour, for clearneſs ſake, to bring this variety of queſtions to the foregoing rules; yet that the main ſubſtance of this Eſſay, was ſuggeſted by that man of peace, the learned, and induſtrious *Grotius*, who having fully examined into the occaſions of the reformation, gave his judgment of them, and plainly diſcovered even ſo long ago, that he thought the difference between the church of *Rome*, and the reformed

churches, not to be greater than I have here hinted, and conſequently, that an accommodation was very poſſible, if the difficulty were not greater from the indiſpoſition of mens minds, than from the real debates that are between them. Hear it in his own words, as tranſlated, and printed, out of his *Vote* for the church's peace.

I obſerved, ſays he, 1. That by the ſchool-men (more ſkilful in *Ariſtotle*'s philoſophy, than in the holy ſcripture, and thoſe antient writers, that illuſtrated Chriſtian religion, both in *Greek* and *Latin*) many doctrines were introduced by a certain liberty of argumentation, not by authority of univerſal councils. 2. That the doctrines eſtabliſhed in the councils, were not by the ſchool-men commodiouſly explained. 3. That amongſt the prelates of the church, ſuch pride, and avarice, and ill manners had prevailed, that they were not ſolicitous, neither to inculcate thoſe good doctrines to the people, as was fit, nor to correct the vices of the people, but took advantage, and made a gain of the peoples ignorance, and of their ſuperſtition, the daughter

daughter of ignorance, and nurſe of vices. 4. That antient doctrine being thus over-clouded, partly appeared not, partly being diſcoloured, ſeemed other than it was. Then judged I, that this was the cauſe, why there was many ages ſince, deſired a reformation, that is a repurgation of doctrine, both from the ſcholaſtic trifles, and diſputes, and from thoſe miſts, which overſhadowed it: And why at laſt (the complaints of Kings, and learned men having been long in vain) ſome Kings ill uſed by ſome of the Popes, and elſewhere private perſons, ſet themſelves about ſuch a reformation, as they could deviſe. But yet this had not the deſired ſucceſs; for in ſeveral places were framed ſeveral confeſſions, and contradictory; and not only the parties that were made, could never cloſe, but alſo new little parties ſprung up every day, ſo many, that none can number them. Yea, credible it is, that new will ariſe perpetually, ſo fruitful is the matter and occaſion of them.

Now, whoever will reflect upon this ſhort relation, muſt obſerve three principal

cipal occaſions for undertaking the reformation. 1. Extravagant ſchool opinions. 2. The doctrines of general councils not commodiouſly explained by ſchool-men. 3. The pride, avarice, and neglect of the prelates of the church of *Rome*. By which three means, the doctrine of the church, partly was overclouded, and partly it appeared other than it was. Hence a reformation was deſired; and what was this reformation to be? A repurgation of doctrine from the *ſcholaſtic trifles*, and from the *miſts that overſhadowed it*.—This is the judgment of this great man, who had ſpent ſo many years in examining into this matter: And now, in his judgment, what is the real difference between the church of *Rome*, and the reformed churches? The only difference is in *ſchool opinions*, *incommodious explications*, and the *diſ-edifying lives of the prelates*.

But it is not by this learned foreigner only, is given hopes of an accommodation; for I have found encouragement at home, both from our own church, and likewiſe from Diſſenters. I name here only one, to repreſent each party,

*viz.*

*viz.* Archbiſhop *Bramhall* for the church, and Mr. *Baxter* for the Diſſenters. The former I find thus cited, and in theſe words making his declaration: A great many of theſe controverſies, which raiſed the higheſt animoſities among Chriſtians at the firſt reformation, are laid aſide by moderate and judicious perſons of both parties, without any miracle, and are kept on foot by ſome blunderers, who follow the old mode, when the faſhion is grown out of date, either out of prejudice, or pride, or want of judgment, or all together. And as many controverſies of the greateſt magnitude, are already as good as reconciled, ſo more may be. There is no oppoſition to be made againſt their evident truth.

And Mr. *Baxter* thus in his life penned by himſelf: My cenſures of the papiſts do much differ from what they were at firſt: I then thought that their errors *in the doctrines of Faith*, were their moſt dangerous miſtakes; as in the points of merits, juſtification by works, aſſurance of ſalvation, the nature of faith, *&c.* But now I am aſſured, that their *miſexpreſſions*, and *miſunderſtandings* of

of us, with our *miſtakings* of them, and *inconvenient expreſſing* our opinions, hath made the difference in theſe points to appear much greater than they are, and that in ſome of them, it is next to none at all. But the great and unreconcileable differences lie in their church tyranny, and uſurpations, and in their great corruptions, and abaſement of God's worſhip, together with their befriending ignorance, and vice. At firſt, I thought, that Mr. *Perkins* well proved, that a papiſt cannot go beyond a reprobate; but now I doubt not, but God hath *many ſanctified ones* amongſt them, who have received the doctrine of Chriſtianity ſo practically, that their contradictory errors prevail not againſt them, to hinder their love of God, and their ſalvation. Alas, at firſt, it would diſgrace any doctrine with me, if I did but hear it called *Popery*, and *Anti-Chriſtian*, but I have long learned to be more impartial, and to diſlike men for bad doctrine, rather than the doctrine for the men, and to know, that Satan can uſe even the names of *Popery* and *Anti-Chriſt* againſt the *truth*.

Thus

Thus theſe two ſpeak their minds, who having taken great pains in enquiring into this whole matter, as appears in their works, muſt be allowed as well qualified for giving their information. The former ſays, that many of the greateſt controverſies are already as good as reconciled by the judicious, though not by blunderers, and that more may be; what better encouragement for this Eſſay?

The other, whoſe either learning, or piety, or induſtry is not ſuſpected by any Diſſenter, ſays, that a great part of the difference between the papiſts, and reformed, is not *in doctrines of faith*, but *miſexpreſſions*, *miſunderſtandings*, *miſtakes*, and *inconvenient expreſſions* on both ſides; and can then any Diſſenter think this ſufficient cauſe for a ſchiſm between churches? And as for thoſe differences, which he ſays are great, and irreconcileable, *viz. Church-tyranny*, *Uſurpations*; theſe, upon enquiry, ſeem to be chiefly differences of the *court* of *Rome*, and not of the *church*, ſince, as it is evident from what has been ſaid above, the communion with that church no where obliges its

mem-

members to aſſent to, or even approve ſuch *tyranny*, or *uſurpations*, or any thing that is befriending *vice*, or *error*; but they are at as full liberty of diſapproving them, as we, who are not of that church. So that the account being duly made up, there ſeems, according to Mr. *Baxter*'s ſcheme, not many differences remaining to be reconciled; eſpecially of thoſe, which he calls *Unreconcileable*; for though they are certainly ſuch, to which we can never be reconciled; yet ſo they are likewiſe to infinite numbers within the church of *Rome*, who can no more be reconciled with them than we, but, with us, are conſtant oppoſers of them.

And here now I cannot but expreſs my great ſurprize at the *Romaniſts* here in this nation; for, whereas they may renounce all that *Tyranny*, and *Uſurpation*, all the *Encroachments of the Pontificat*, and the *Unlimited Supremacy*, with all thoſe other *principles*, and *practices*, which are points that render them obnoxious to the government: whereas, I ſay, they may do this without injury to their profeſſion of faith, or any one term

of

of their communion; they ſtand ſtill, and ſuffer both in their perſons, and eſtates, and in the moſt infamous character caſt upon their church, as the teacher of ſuch deteſtable doctrines, without ever once endeavouring to juſtify themſelves to the ſtate, or clearing themſelves, or the church from the ſcandal of ſuch doctrines.

This is a matter of ſurprize to me, and ſeems (they will give me leave to tell them ſo) a *great folly* in them. For, though to ſuffer peaceably for their faith, be commendable, and what they eſteem the part of a confeſſor, or martyr, yet to ſuffer for *ſchool opinions*, for the divinity of *Bellarmin*, or in compliment to the *court of Rome*, (ſuch as are all the points above) is what may give them a title to *humour*, or *madneſs*; but never to any recompence in heaven, ſince God has no where engaged his word to be the rewarder of ſuch ſuffering: And what is the occaſion of their being diſtinguiſhed, by the ſeverity of penalties, from all other bodies of Chriſtians, but theſe very points? Can they imagine the ſtate is ſo averſe to their *ſpeculative doctrines*, as upon this ſcore only, to proſecute them

with ſo many penal ſtatutes? Do not they ſee all manner of ſpeculative opinions are tolerated by law, and even ſuch as ſeem levelled againſt Chriſtianity? And can they think then, that their ſpeculations are the occaſion of their ſuffering? Such great partiality in ſpeculatives, cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed, eſpecially in perſons who expreſs ſo great a compaſſion to tender conſciences, and diſapprove perſecution upon the ſole ſcore of religion. Upon which conſideration, the inference ſeems rational, that if they had a mind no longer to be *Bellarmin's martyrs*, nor *confeſſors for School opinions*, but give the ſtate ſecurity of never abetting ſuch pernicious principles, * they might hope to come in with their ſpeculations, and have a ſhare of that favour, which is ſhewn to Jews, Quakers, and Socinians, and not fear extirpation upon the account of harmleſs religious notions.

And this they may do, for they know thoſe enflaming doctrines are no part of their

* The Roman Catholics of England and Ireland, have lately, agreeable to act of Parliament, given a full and ſolemn teſt of their abhorrence of ſuch pernicious principles, as well as of their allegiance and attachment to the King, and civil Conſtitution of their Country.

their faith, neither does their church any where enjoin an aſſent to them; nay they know theſe very principles are oppoſed by firm members of their own communion, and in practice reſolutely withſtood. Why then do they ſtand ſtill, and ſuffer on this account, and by their ſilence give occaſion to the whole nation of believing their church to be ſo infamous, as to teach ſuch doctrines, and that as many as are in its communion are bound to receive them? This ſilence I cannot underſtand. But not to exceed in this digreſſion, I return, and conclude with this wiſh, that our preſent generation, both divines, and others would have ſome regard to the deliberate judgment of the learned, who have given ſuch encouragement to this preſent eſſay, and to the method of a catholic peace. I cannot pretend thoſe I have mentioned through this little work to be exempt from error; but I can ſay, they were men of as great learning, ſound judgment, and eminent piety, as our church has ever brought forth; and having with a particular induſtry, applied their labours to the ſtudy of the antient

antient fathers and primitive Chriſtianity, they muſt be allowed the beſt qualified to ſpeak in this point. It is not then an ill name, or flinging dirt at them (the prevailing arms of paſſion, ignorance and prejudice) is enough to overthrow their evidence; but this ought to be reverenced, till there appears a different account from ſome others, who have a more certain inſight into the apoſtolic times. And who are theſe? Under the authority then of theſe great, and learned men, I take ſhelter againſt all reproaches, but with much more comfort, under the bleſſing of *Beati Pacifici: Bleſſed are the peace-makers*; while I ſeek nothing but the cure of ſchiſm, and the bleſſing of peace.

FINIS.